

Correspondence ID: 12001 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, Kelly
Received: May,09,2010 18:35:10
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: 12002 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,09,2010 18:37:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: COMMENTS ON Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement March 2010

GENERAL COMMENTS FOLLOW 1. I ask for a 45-DAY EXTENSION on the time to comment. These volumes are simply too big for the public to review them, digest them, and make reasonable comments within the original 60-day timeframe.

2. KEEP HATTERAS INLET OPEN TO THE MAX PRACTICAL EXTENT. It offers unique visitor experience on the island and in some respects on the entire east coast. Hatteras Inlet is the best area on Hatteras Island for fly-fishing, and casting lures for mackerel and bluefish, especially the portion of the inlet where a tidal rip develops. It is not well suited to bottom fishing because of the current, even though some try it. The "rip" at the Inlet is unique on Hatteras Island in that regard; it's not suited to bottom fishing so it offers a unique location to lure-fish (including salt-water fly-fishing and with great results. It should be possible to allow ORV access via an extended Pole Road (the old Coast Guard Road) inside the existing dune line without impact to shore birds. If anything such a road might discourage foxes and other predators. I note that you have proposed such access in some Alternatives.

3. KEEP CAPE POINT OPEN TO THE MAXIMUM PRACTICAL EXTENT. It is probably the best fishing location on the east coast. SPECIFIC COMMENTS FOLLOW: 1.NO-ACTION ALTERNATIVE. From my experience, Congress intended that the no-action alternative be technically analyzed as a worst-case condition so other alternatives could be compared to no-action. In this case, no action should be what would happen if there were literally no ORV management and vehicles drove everywhere. NPS should then discuss impacts associated with no action. These impacts should be quantitative; and they should be compared to quantitative impacts associated with other plans. For example, for Piping Plover you should state the impacts to the species for open access ORV use. What is the National implication to the overall species? (Probably very little ? the CAHA population is quite small). What is the regional implication? (Probably would result in the loss of PIPL at the Seashore). It is then possible to compare the numbers of PIPL that could be expected under various alternatives. This is the No Action Plan as Congress intended.

Your current method of comparing plans is descriptive rather than quantitative and the basis for the differing description of impacts associated with each alternative is not clear.

By examining experience at Cape Lookout National Seashore, with much less visitation and minimal ORV use, you should be able to make an estimate of what the outcome to the species would be under Alternative F under this DEIS.

With boundaries (worst case ? a true no-action; and best case-Alternative F) set, you should estimate quantitatively what the impacts are for various alternatives. How will productivity rates improve from Alternative A to Alternative F? How will populations fare under all alternatives?

The lack of qualitative analysis indicates a lack of rigor in the scientific analysis and questions the validity of the DEIS. It presents the appearance of opinions rather than science.

While Alternatives A&B are legitimate options, I am opposed to calling Alternatives A&B "no-action" alternatives. They include many actions and are not the intent of Congress for a true no-action Alternative.

2. DEIS, Table 1, page 8. The goal of 1.5 chicks per pair for Piping Plover productivity seems too optimistic.

To establish a goal for Plover productivity one could look at Cape Lookout National Seashore. The Barrier islands of the Cape Lookout National seashore are not inhabited and there is only limited vehicle usage so it should represent the high end of productivity for Piping Plover in North Carolina. Heat-stress and weather are the primary factors for low fledge rates noted at Cape Lookout in their Annual Piping Plover Report. These conditions would certainly also apply to Cape Hatteras. The highest fledgling success rate ever recorded at Cape Lookout Seashore was 0.92 (chicks fledged per pair) in 2004.

Yet, the DEIS simply uses FWS information and sets a 5-yr average goal of 1.5 chicks per pair as a long term goal. That's more than 50% higher than an uninhabited area that has almost no ORV. Since the goals established for Cape Hatteras under the DEIS appear unreasonably high, it appears that NPS is currently assessing unreasonably high impacts associated with ORV use in Cape Hatteras Seashore.

Further, the study titled "GIS-based analysis of human disturbance on piping plover abundance, distribution and productivity on the barrier islands of Long Island, New York" by SK Thomsen, May 2006 found productivity of 1 for areas completely restricted from ORV use; in cooler climates where productivity would be high; with large Plover populations (in the hundreds); and over a three year period that averaged out variability of productivity. This best case scenario only resulted in productivity rates of 1.0, therefore, the DEIS goal of 1.5 is not reasonable.

These high goals also seem to imply that the impacts of ORV are being overstated in the DEIS.

More reasonable goals should be established.

3. Regarding, PIPL productivity, the study titled, "GIS-based analysis of human disturbance on piping plover abundance, distribution and productivity on the barrier islands of Long Island, New York" by SK Thomsen, May 2006 is most appropriate to the DEIS and it should be discussed and referenced in the DEIS.

4. One of the findings of the study titled, "GIS-based analysis of human disturbance on piping plover abundance, distribution and productivity on the barrier islands of Long Island, New York" by SK Thomsen, May 2006 was that Piping Plover productivity in areas where there were no ORV restrictions was the same as those in areas closed to ORV. The paper stated "No consistent pattern of differences in mean productivity was observed among the three levels of ORV access (Table 4). The level with the highest productivity was unrestricted access in 2003, seasonal access in 2004, and restricted access in 2005. Likewise, the level with the lowest productivity also varied from year to year. Differences were significant in 2003 (ANOVA, $f = 5.55$ $p=0.004$) and 2005 ($f = 3.17$ $p= 0.043$), but not 2004 ($f=1.07$ $p= 0.344$). However, when all years were pooled together mean productivity was not significantly different between levels of ORV access (0.951 0.05 SE in restricted access, 1.011 0.08 in seasonal access and 1.061 0.15 in unrestricted

access; ANOVA $f=0.37$ $p=0.689$." Table 4. Mean Productivity for each category of ORV access compared to overall year 2003 2004 2005 Overall restricted 0.8 1 0.08 0.98 1 0.09 1.07 1 0.11 0.951 0.05 seasonal 1.29 1 0.16 1.19 1 0.14 0.66 1 0.12 1.011 0.08 unrestricted 1.5 1 0.35 0.8 1 0.25 1.0 1 0.22 1.061 0.15 overall 0.96 1 0.07 1.03 1 0.07 0.931 0.08

The study is important because it extends over several years; is based on the latest technological advances using GIS; is rigorous in its statistical analysis; and examines large populations so results are statistically significant.

Surely NPS experience at Hatteras Seashore would support a lower buffer that would still protect the Plover. The more conservative buffers proposed under the DEIS seem to conflict with prior smaller buffers and an NPS FONSI for the Interim Plan under Alternate A.

5. Please modify the DEIS to allow intensive monitoring of Piping Plover chicks as a future Option/possibility to the 1000M buffer currently required.

As an alternative to the 1000M buffer used in the DEIS for Plover chicks, even conservative FWS guidelines do allow smaller buffers if intensive management (consisting of more observation) is applied to PIPL. While the FWS guidelines indicate that a qualified biologist should do the monitoring, with proper training, any reasonably intelligent volunteer or summer intern should be able to provide observation necessary to allow smaller buffers. Closure areas would be moved if broods were mobile.

I feel the DEIS should address this possibility as an Option under any of the plans, so that if a suitable system of monitoring (either by NPS personnel, by volunteers, or perhaps paid observers) could be developed later, it would already be covered under the EIS.

NPS should balance visitation with conservation. FWS guidelines do not balance these needs, since the FWS charter is solely conservation. As noted in FWS discussions, their buffers are recommendations ? not law.

In general, all of the buffers are overly conservative and I am opposed to these unnecessarily restrictive buffers.

6. The DEIS describes, Alternative A as No Action: Continuation of Management under the Interim Protected Species Management Strategy?. Further described as, "management of ORV use and access at the Seashore would be a continuation of management based on the 2007 FONSI for the Interim Strategy?"

If you have a "Finding of No Significant Impact" for Alternative A; and alternative A is the least costly; and it has the least restriction to the public's use of the Park; NPS should recommend Alternative A. This calls into question earlier management strategies and why (assuming they had FONSI's) this EIS was performed and why there has been such a large change in direction by NPS.

Perhaps there is a good reason that the EIS conflicts with previous FONSI's. If it isn't already covered in the DEIS, the reasons should be explained in the DEIS document.

7. Page xlvi, Table TABLE ES-3. SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE ELEMENT, 1st column, bottom of the page: "Impacts of the Alternative to Preservation Values" (for Alternate A), the DEIS states that "As a result of the long-term minor to major impacts to protected species, impacts to preservation values would be long-term moderate adverse."

The statement that "impacts to preservation values would be long-term moderate adverse" does not seem compatible with a prior "Finding of No Significant Impact" for this alternative. Please explain why this conclusion is different from past decisions. The DEIS must clarify this discrepancy or it appears that the scientific conclusions from past analysis have been changed solely due to pressure from outside the NPS.

8. Of the Alternatives presented, I feel that Alternative A best serves the public and protects the environment. a. If you look at past history, Piping Plover populations went down across all of NC not just in CAHA (in fact the curves are nearly identical). I point this out because other areas of NC are subject to only minimal ORV use and PIPL left those areas too, either because of habitat loss from erosion (from increased storm activity that has lowered the beach too much) or simply global warming. b. I think NPS did a good job of balancing the environment and public access prior to the consent decree.

9. Regarding, "Alternative B ? No Action: Continuation of Terms of the Consent Decree Signed April 30, 2008, and amended June 4, 2009?." follow the terms described under alternative A, except as modified by the provisions of the consent decree?

Alternative B pits environmental interests vs. beach-driving interests and encourages both parties to do the wrong thing. Those supporting driving on the beach are encouraged to harm PIPL and those who want no-ORV access are encouraged to vandalize shorebird signs so that protected areas are increased in size.

Rather than pitting the 2 interests, you should look to align the interests of all sides. NPS and FWS should take a hard look at establishing a take limit. Take limits are allowed under the Endangered Species Act due to economic hardship. A "Take-limit" would set a predetermined limit for taking of Plover (and other species) by ORV. The idea would be to lower buffer zones to allow more public access, but increase buffer zones if there was a Take. The beach going public would then have an incentive to protect shorebirds rather than harm them. To protect their own interests those who want to continue driving on the beach would become enforcers protecting shorebird interests rather than the current us vs. them mentality. Some education of the public would be required under this idea so a permit system for all beach driving would be probably be required.

10. ALTERNATIVE F: MANAGEMENT BASED ON ADVISORY COMMITTEE INPUT. I am opposed to Alternative F. It does not balance visitation with protection of resources, but instead goes much further than needed to conserve resources.

11. Part 1, Draft Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan / EIS, Table 8. Summary of Alternative Elements, Page, 113, Pets. The DEIS states: "Alternative C: Pets would be prohibited within all Nonbreeding Shorebird SMAs that are otherwise open to recreational use." Regarding the term "Otherwise open to recreational use", my comment is: For all plans when an area is open to recreational use, pets should be allowed on leash in those areas. Visitors bring pets on vacation. Visitors bring pets in their ORV and walk those pets for exercise. It seems to be extreme overkill to allow recreation in an area, but not pets on leash. The proposed buffers cover pets as well as pedestrian.

This pet management philosophy is carried into all subsequent plans and my comment also applies to D, E, and F.

12. DEIS, Part 2, Page 210, Paragraph Human Activity. Your data shows there were only 5 dog violations of nesting plover closures in 2008 (NPS 2009b). You noted 19 dog violations in the pre-nesting closures in 2009. The wording of the data changes for each year so it is not clear whether the trend is up or down. Overall, this is a very small number of violations and it indicates that the Pet restrictions proposed are not needed. The word is getting out and return visitors are concerned about natural resources. Again, I am opposed to restricting pets as proposed in Alternatives C, D, & F.

13. DEIS, Part 2, Page 211. The DEIS states, "For example, a study conducted on Cape Cod, Massachusetts, found that the average distance at which piping plovers were disturbed by pets was 46 meters (151 feet), compared with 23 meters (75 feet) for pedestrians." 46 meters is well below the buffers listed for Plover. It would appear that even with a reasonable safety factor, pets should pose little problem as long as leash rules are followed. It is likely that FWS guidelines included pets as a consideration when setting recommendations for Buffers. Again, I am opposed to restricting pets as proposed in Alternatives C, D, & F ? it is not supported by reasonable interpretation of the science.

14. Page 90, Chapter 2: Alternatives, Top of Page, Paragraph: Provide an Area for Off-Leash Dogs This paragraph states "Creation of off-leash areas would not be consistent with 36 CFR 2.13 and would require promulgation of a special regulation allowing off-leash dog use, which is outside the scope of the plan/EIS." It would seem to be simple enough to cover the possibility of an off-leash area under the DEIS and go thru the process to promulgate a special regulation later. I oppose leaving this out of the DEIS. The DEIS is not a regulation per se, so inclusion of the possibility of an off leash area in the EIS wouldn't mean that it would become regulation until the proper CFR process was completed and even then it might be opposed so it might never become a reality. If it were included in the DEIS, then a major step would have been taken to modify the CFR later if it were found to be viable.

15. Map 5 of 7, page 179 of the DEIS shows that for Alternative F you have proposed an intra-dune road to Hatteras Inlet. It is not clear how accurate the mapping is, but the distance to the Inlet from the Parking area scales as 1 mile. This is an unacceptably long distance for Pedestrians, especially children, to walk in hot weather when carrying fishing gear. Any alternatives that show a parking area and pedestrian access to the beaches should minimize walking distance. For ORV's the pedestrian access can be very close, unlike those for paved areas.

16. DEIS Part 2, Chapter 3: Affected Environment, Page 190, the DEIS states that dredge spoil sites are ideal habitat as follows: "(8) Natural conditions of sparse vegetation and little or no topographic relief mimicked in artificial habitat types (e.g., dredge spoil sites)." Yet just a few Pages later you counter this positive statement concerning dredged material with an incorrect one.

On the last sentence of page 211, continuing onto page 212 you state, "A recent study theorized that beach nourishment projects may negatively impact plover habitat because the resulting dredge spoil is often fine-grained, reducing the availability of pebbles and cobbles, which are a preferred substrate for nesting plovers (Cohen, Wunker, and Fraser 2008)."

This statement is not valid for habitat at Cape Hatteras Seashore ? there is no pebble or cobble substrate on Cape Hatteras. This study probably applies to New England where the Plover is most prevalent. On Hatteras shorebirds prefer to nest in areas of high shell content and dredged material from areas close to Hatteras (ocean or sounds) are likely to contain relatively high shell-quantities that are preferred by Plovers and other shorebirds.

These points are important because dredged material from the ferry channel to Ocracoke have been used with considerable success to nourish the beach near Ramp 55 in the past. Material was coarse sand and shell ? ideal bird habitat on Hatteras.
Please delete those statements that don't apply to Cape Hatteras Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12003 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,09,2010 18:38:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12004 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Haller, William C
Received: May,09,2010 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. Moreover, as I'm sure you are aware, ORV use in the Seashore was allowed to the extent it was consistent with existing uses of local residents. This is a far cry from current recreation-based 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.

Correspondence ID: 12005 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Curd, Denise
Received: May,09,2010 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) Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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 is an abundance of National Forest areas where ORV use is allowed for this recreational purpose. Most, if not all National Parks do not allow this use because of the damage to the fragile resources. Please consider these factors before a final draft of the rules for the management of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12006 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,09,2010 18:42:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with many issues about the DEIS. I think you need to throw it out and use the Coalition for Beach Access's suggestions as a guideline instead as best alternative to your DEIS.
 Lack of access denies continuation of cultural & educational resources & the tradition of lifesaving on Hatteras Island. Foremost in my mind is the current closures in place at Hatteras Inlet. A recent case in point at Hatteras Inlet, on 1 May 2010 the overturning of the F/V Tiderunner resulted in 6 people flailing for their lives in view of the beach.
 Had people been allowed to recreate there on the beach on that beautiful sunny Saturday as people have done on Hatteras Island for centuries, people would have seen the accident and could have made a phone call and the crew and family of the Tiderunner might gone home together, all alive, that evening. Instead adults & children had no choice but to brave the seas until offshore fleet arrived four hours later.
 The drowning death of Mr Aaron would have been prevented if Hatteras point was accessible.
 Shame on you Park Service for being bullied into this irresponsible, draconian plan imposed upon us without adequate public input by Judge Boyle. I feel that you & all those factions that pushed for these closures are all responsible for Mr Aarrons death.
 State-listed "species of concern," do not require the extensive 1000-meter buffers and beach closures mandated for federally listed species. When was the recreational area of Cape Hatteras Nat'l Seashore designated a wildlife refuge? I thought Pea Island was the refuge?!!
 And why are you taking such herculean measure to keep turtle nests where they are laid when most the storms wash them away just as they are about to hatch, why not relocate them to perhaps a safe location instead of closing access to the beach for virtually 2 months?
 The fact that the science in your DEIS or lack thereof extrapolated just what serves the special interest groups instead of looking at the overall effect these overzealous closures have on all wildlife, residents & visitors to Hatteras Island is disturbing & terrifying when I consider all the implications to my life and community.
 I have walked & drove the beaches here on Hatteras for over 46 years. I have seen the changes, both positive and negative effects. I think the current hypermanagement of the lands & wildlife of Cape Hatteras is severely out of balance.
 As a daily visitor & dog walker at our beaches at Cape Hatteras, I find it disturbing that you plan to prevent leashed pets at the park. Why must all pets be discriminated against? I board dogs here on Hatteras. Where are we supposed go for our daily dog walking meditations?
 It is not okay with me that the park service continues the practice of exterminating perceived predators of a single species of shorebird. Your trapping & killing the wildlife is appalling.
 It is also not okay with me that park service thinks its okay to rope off beach here to protect some critters(but okay to exterminate others?) only to raze the landscape & disturb habitat elsewhere to accommodate parking lots and interdunal roads.
 Did you notice in the past 2 years that the ORV closures on the beach resulted in more vegetation establishing itself thus making the habitat less desirable for nesting? ORV access in the past actually kept the plant vegetation down on the beach thus the birds picked the wide open spaces created by sea & maintained by vehicles in the first place!
 It's obvious the birds had no problem with the ORVs in years before this consent decree so I feel that park service should go back to the way it had been in the past with minimum sized buffers on mammals nests.
 As diverse as Hatteras Island is, there are plenty resources here to accommodate the needs of both people & wildlife in a balanced & responsible manner in peaceful coexistence.
 Thanks for considering my comments. namaste

Correspondence ID: 12007 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 18:45:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly support Alternative F of the DEIS.
 While a case for expanded off-road vehicle access and a priority for recreational use is being pursued by many, including the impact restricted ORV access and recreational use may have on the local economy, the fundamental purpose and higher priority in the establishment of the Cape Hatteras Seashore must be observed: the protection and preservation of the natural environment and the natural resources it contains.
 Alternative F is a means to pursue the fundamental purpose of the Seashore in way that future generations will appreciate -- persons of all generations and all interests; not a narrow interest in ORV access and fishing, to be enjoyed by only a few.
 Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12008 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Helfman, Laura
Received: May,09,2010 18:46:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against OTV use on Cape Hattaras. Leave it natural!

Correspondence ID: 12009 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 18:47:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern, To deny access to these miniscule areas for the minute population of tax paying AMERICAN citizens is a travesty. Retain access for users by education.

Correspondence ID: 12010 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hagemann, Fran
Received: May,09,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: COMMENTS ON ALTERNATIVE F (NPS Preferred Alternative)
 Re: Closures due to Birds
 I disagree with the NPS' buffer for the Piping Plover of 1000 meters. I belive a buffer of 200 meters would be more than enough. I also do not think that we should have buffer zones for birds that are not on the endangered list.
 Re: Closures due to Turtles
 I disagree with the NPS closure of 105 meters for Turtles. I believe that Turtle nests can be relocated with great success when they are in an area that is not safe. Turtle relocation is very successful in other states.
 Re: Pet Restrictions
 I strongly disagree with the NPS' position on pet restrictions. I believe that all pets should be allowed on the beach. Dogs should be on a 6' leash.

Correspondence ID: 12011 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: hagemann, kenneth c
Received: May,09,2010 18:47:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: COMMENTS ON ALTERNATIVE F (NPS Preferred Alternative)
 Re: Closures due to Birds
 I disagree with the NPS buffer for the Piping Plover of 1000 meters. I believe a buffer of 200 meters would be more than appropriate as no where else in any park, state or federal, are closures for any type of bird 1000 meters. Also I disagree with closures for birds that are not on the endangered species list but only species of concern.
 Re: Closures due to Turtles
 I strongly disagree to the 105 meter wide closure for Turtle nests. Closures should be 10 meters square during the day. Also the night driving restrictions are not needed because there has been no documented adverse effects that have been caused by night driving on the beaches. Nesting Turtles have not been killed by night driving on the beaches and there has been no loss of nests due to human activity that occurred frequently. A pro-active Turtle nest night watch program would certainly assure no ORV impact on Turtle nests. Relocation of Turtle nests due to weather events have been successful in many other beach areas similar to Cape Hatteras Seashore. False crawl statistics do not support the theory that light pollution is a significant problem in the area. Also it is well known that predator and nest enclosure practices encourage ghost crabs which are a primary predator of Turtle nest eggs.
 Re: Pet Restrictions
 I strongly disagree with the restriction of access of pets on the beach anytime for dogs and horses. The dogs should be kept on a 6' leash and the horses should be properly supervised by their owners or handlers. There is no documentation that I know of that relates to horse back riding on the beach creating any adverse effect on nesting birds or turtles. There should be daytime law enforcement patrol to better monitor any violations regarding the lack of properly supervised pets.

Correspondence ID: 12012 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 18:48:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

Correspondence ID: 12013 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 18:48:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

Correspondence ID: 12014 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 18:48:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

me.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12015 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,09,2010 18:48:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12016 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,09,2010 18:48:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. . Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

Correspondence ID: 12017 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,09,2010 18:48:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12018 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,09,2010 18:49:11

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: 12019 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,09,2010 18:49:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12020 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,09,2010 18:49:17

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12021 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 18:49:22
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: 12022 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 18:49:22
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: 12023 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 12024 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 18:49:28
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: 12025 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 18:49:28
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: 12026 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Oliver, Jerry
Received: May,09,2010 18:49:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No gasoline vehicles in Parks,

Correspondence ID: 12027 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Boyer, Alyson L
Received: May,09,2010 18:53:34
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: 12028 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: ,
Received: May,09,2010 18:54:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Every effort must be taken to protect our precious lands and seas. Fossil fuels are the primary sources of our current consumption, but we must put in stricter regulations to clamp down on oil and coal company CEOs who take shortcuts to make more obscene profits. Alternative methods like solar, wind and nuclear (done the safe way) must be SERIOUSLY looked at.

Correspondence ID:	12029	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 18:57:27						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>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.</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. Thanks</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12030	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	witmer, chris						
Received:	May,09,2010 18:58:25						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please prohibit off road vehicle on the Cape Hatteras Beaches Protect the environment and keep it as it is.						
Correspondence ID:	12031	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Mylott, Sharon J						
Received:	May,09,2010 18:59:17						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Off road vehicles should not be allowed in the park. It would cause great harm to the environment & ecosystems of the area.						
Correspondence ID:	12032	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Mastin-Kamps, Janice						
Received:	May,09,2010 19:02:27						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12033	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,09,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Preserve the natural environment please!						
Correspondence ID:	12034	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,09,2010 19:12:50						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	The beaches of Hatteras should be open for all citizens to enjoy. There should be a way to protect our wildlife and enjoy our beaches without such extreme measures.						
Correspondence ID:	12035	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 19:14:17						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						

Correspondence: First of all please know that I believe in the protection of endangered species. That being said, I want you to know that I have enjoyed many wonderful vacations at the Outer Banks. These vacations have provided myself and my children with memories so vivid and special. I am upset that my future vacations are in jeopardy due the closure of the beautiful beaches. Why do the measures to protect these birds have to be so drastic? Do you realize what this will do to an already failing economy? How many people will be out of jobs? How many homeowners will be unable to pay their mortgage due to families having to make the decision to vacation elsewhere while their homes have no renters for the season? I would like to know specifically the names of the people responsible for this along with their contact information. In studying the impact on the piping plover, has anyone studied the impact on the many lives that depend on the tourist industry? Does this not make one sit back and think how unfair and unjust this would be to the wonderful people of the Outer Banks? When do birds become more important than people? One more question--is the Piping Plover native to this area? In doing some research I found that it is not. Why can't there be a compromise? A safe area for these species and beach access for the rest of us? I don't want to vacation anywhere but here. Please don't force me to do so.

Correspondence ID: 12036 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,09,2010 19:15:47
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: 12037 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:17:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for considering my comments. I do not believe that off road vehicles have a place in Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park. Since it was set aside by congress to be retained as "primitive" and, as such, to be preserved as a place for those seeking a wilderness experience. Hikers and birders that seek a natural setting away from being subjected to inappropriate things like ORV's. I do not believe they have a place there. They create pollution, are simply too loud, and would ruin the very nature of the "out of the way" experience most of us seek in such a wonderful place.

Correspondence ID: 12038 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:18:25
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: 12039 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:19:13
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: 12040 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:19:13
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: 12041 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:19:13
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. As a resident and truly green business owner on Hatteras Island I believe Defenders Of Wildlife has misrepresented the situation regarding ORV usage.. During the winter of 2008-09, while Ocracoke Island replaced all of the bridges on route 12, all traffic had to be diverted to the beach. After the completion of the bridges and subsequent opening of route 12, there was no evidence on the beach of the massive amount of traffic the beach bore. Responsible beach driving is the norm on these beaches, with a vast majority of the ORV drivers and occupants having respect for all species and their nesting areas. With common sense management, that allows access with regulation would be optimum, but highly unlikely.

For Defenders to paint this grim picture here on Hatteras Island, of ignorant, gritty locals and uncaring, hotrodding ORV drivers makes me wonder what kind of spin they have been putting on other crucial matters.

As a long time activist, greenpeace supporter and volunteer, I can honestly say that all is not what it seems here. I strongly support any and all causes that confront injustice, expose fraud and or greed. In this case I believe Defenders is spoon feeding well intended folks a position on a crucial issue, that is not in their best interest.

People who live and work on Hatteras Island, in this case, know better. I am insulted by Defender's position and they should be embarrassed. There was a time when I respected their position out of hand. I know better now.

Defenders are taking issue with beach driving, but they are missing the point. This is about access, period. This forum is quaint, but we all know what's coming. Permanent beach closures are our future and we better get used to it. Shore birds and turtles are simply convenient tools used to wrest control of this last American stand of freedom. Shame on you Defenders Of Wildlife

Correspondence ID: 12042 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:19:13
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:	12043	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 19:19:13						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12044	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,09,2010 19:25:46						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please keep off the road vehicles off of the Cape Haterras National Seashore. They destroy the environment phycally and auditory. AH						
Correspondence ID:	12045	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Shelton, Angela F						
Received:	May,09,2010 19:25:48						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please do not go ahead with the plans. Cape Hatteras is a wonderful place to visit and great place for wildlife. Both of these things bring tourists to the area. Some people come just for the wildlife. Think of the money to be lost if the wildlife are displaced. Hatteras is beautiful and should not have any changes made!						
Correspondence ID:	12046	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 19:28:28						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I have been a frequent visitor to Hatteras Island for 15 years and am extremely concerned with the proposed limitations on beach access. My family have enjoyed the beaches and have always been very respectful of the wildlife around us and try to leave things better than when we arrive. I am also a kiter and surfer. The restrictions over the last few years and large number of beach closings has severely impacted our time on the island. Please consider that the large percentage of people are trying to do the right thing and want to continue to enjoy the beach areas. Can we not co-exist with the birds? How is it that the birds are more entitled to the beaches than we are?</p> <p>I hope to continue to enjoy the beaches on Hatteras Island for years to come. Please consider an alternative that allows us to enjoy the area along with the birds that is reasonable.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12047	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Clark, Sue E						
Received:	May,09,2010 19:29:57						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I fully agree with he way Cape Hatteras National Seashore has been managed for the past several years. The wildlife has been protected by fences during breeding season and the people have had access to the beaches for recreational use. In my opinion, there has been a healthy balance between wildlife and man. I see no reason for change.</p> <p>I strongly agree with the current practice of fencing off breeding areas for wildlife and allowing the use of ORVs near the waters edge.</p> <p>I disagree with closing off the beach for turtles because the hatchlings have not had a problem in the past due to traffic.</p> <p>I strongly disagree with prohibiting pets on the beaches and park lands. Pets on a 6 foot leash pose no problems. Furthermore, I see no reason why dogs cannot be off leash outside of the tourist season. (I am not a dog owner)</p> <p>Horses should be allowed in designated driving areas.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12048	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,09,2010 19:33:14						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all</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: 12049 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:35:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Must we defile and destroy every remaining bit of wilderness?
The NPS lands are the final defense of nature from the abuses of man. Please take your stewardship seriously and ban off road motorized vehicles in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12050 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Messenger, Thomas
Received: May,09,2010 19:36:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: End unregulated beach driving with an effective vehicle management plan that guarantees adequate space and protections for wildlife while improving public access to the beaches for pedestrians to enhance visitor enjoyment in balance with wildlife conservation.

Correspondence ID: 12051 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:40:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I love the Hatteras sound and usually visit once per year from Portland, OR. I have stayed in various towns including Avon and Waves. I have been going to visit on windsurfing or kitesurfing vacations, usually with a group of friends who make the same voyage. I have traveled to OBX for 35 years and support maintaining open access to the beaches for all recreational use. Please maintain access! Sincerely, Kenneth Lie

Correspondence ID: 12052 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Ross, Kimra Y
Received: May,09,2010 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,
Kimra Ross

Correspondence ID: 12053 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:44:36
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: 12054 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:48:25
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: 12055 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:48:31
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: 12056 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:49:14
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: 12057 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:49:14
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: 12058 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:49:14
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: 12059 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:49:14
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: 12060 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:49:20

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: 12061 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:49:25
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: 12062 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 19:49:25
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: 12063 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Savage, Dorothy
Received: May,09,2010 19:55:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off-road vehicles are a nuisance anywhere they are allowed and cause a blight on the landscape. Please do not let that happen to this beautiful, peaceful beach. That would be a tragedy.

Correspondence ID: 12064 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Menkes, B
Received: May,09,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We need an ORV plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrians and wildlife than vehicles. 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:	12065	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 19:58:55						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Why are huge buffer zones that restrict pedestrians/ORV's that are instituted on Cape Hatteras on land monitored by NPS not the same as for Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge. Do pedestrians not disturb the Piping Plovers in the Refuge? It seems to me that if the substantial buffers that are required in one instance should be followed through all the way around. Or, do the "birds" not necessarily need buffer zones that are the size of many football fields? Unless, of course, pedestrians do not truly interfere with the birds as is stated by SELC, et. al. Why doesn't the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service have to monitor breeding pairs and track this information the same as required of NPS. These numbers and data are significantly important to justify the claims asserted that the numbers are down. As pedestrians are pushed away from Cape Hatteras then beach combing and shelling are certainly going to become more attractive on the Refuge.</p> <p>The extreme restrictions under the Consent Decree and Alternative F do not represent what our forefathers deemed the purpose of the Cape Hatteras National "Recreational" Seashore. Measures have been adequate under the Interim Management Strategy to allow for Pedestrian/ORV Beach Access and due the duty to protect the species of concern.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12066	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Lewton, David G						
Received:	May,09,2010 19:59:53						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I have seen the damage that off road vehicles can do to fragile eco-systems. The desert areas surrounding Phoenix Arizona, where I live, have been trashed wherever it has been allowed and "four-wheeling" has become an every day activity.</p> <p>I have not been to your part of the world for a very long time. I remember it well and fondly. I pray that you will not allow it to be destroyed.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12067	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 19:59:58						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12068	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Black, Pauline J						
Received:	May,09,2010 20:07:59						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I lived on Bodie Island from age 4 to age 9 (1963-68). Walking on those serene beaches was the highlight of my childhood. When I turned 50, I realized my dream of returning, sharing that wonderful place with my husband and children. They were enchanted, as I have been nearly all my life. They loved the beaches of Bodie and Ocracoke Islands. We weren't there when the turtles were renewing their lives, but we were in awe of the multitude of life forms that those beaches support. These beaches are fragile. Where there were three dunes in front of my home, there is now only one. So many life forms depend on these islands. Allowing motorized vehicles endangers all the the wildlife. It also ruins the experience for so many human visitors. Vehicles are already allowed in too many places. Please preserve this incredible place and do not expand the areas where vehicles are allowed. Thank you for taking care of our wilderness and our future.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12069	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	gay, kelly d						
Received:	May,09,2010 20:08:30						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Do not destroy our fragile beaches with off-road vehicles.						
Correspondence ID:	12070	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Johnson, Christi						
Received:	May,09,2010 20:09:08						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>Now that I've spent time on beaches with off road vehicles and cars, I've learned how rude they are to others. It was very disruptive and disturbing trying to walk on the beach with these vehicles zipping around causing the sand to fly in my face and hair.</p> <p>The other disturbing thing about these people is when they got themselves stuck in the water and waves, they actually expected help from the rangers on the beach. I did not want to help them. I prefer just stay stuck.</p> <p>Please don't let another beach get taken over by rude, smelly, obnoxious motorized vehicles on the beach. Give 'em a race track.</p>						

Correspondence ID: 12071 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Waller, Sheryl
Received: May,09,2010 20:14:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Mr. Murray,
I have been a visitor and now a resident of the Outer Banks for the past 26 years. One of the primary reasons that I came here for, was to be able to use the National Park without a myriad of unnecessarily strict regulations. I participate in a number of recreational activities that make Cape Hatteras National Seashore a truly unique environment. I am in favor of protecting the wildlife, but within reason and not at the exclusion of humans, as proposed by the Alternative "F" Plan. The proposed plans will have a huge negative economic impact on this area. The National Parks were set up to allow for use and recreation by the public.
I disagree that ORV's should be prohibited year round in some areas.(pages 97-101) Human impact has not been proven to be the cause of any piping plover deaths and the chart shows that less than 3% of nest failures are attributed to humans. (Pages 104 and 377.)
I disagree with the 1,000 meter buffers and feel that they are larger than necessary. (Pages 121-127)
I disagree that leashed pets interfere with wildlife and feel that restricting all pets during the breeding season is unnecessary. It is shown that predators, such as opossums and ghost crabs, cause most of the damage. (page 136)
I disagree that night driving should be prohibited from May 1- November 15th. (page 104) Night driving discourages predators from foraging the nests of birds.
By imposing all of the proposed restrictions, our current use of this area will be negatively altered. The impact will be grave and much of the positive features of living here will be taken away. I will seriously consider leaving the area to find a much more reasonable balance between wildlife management and human access to our National Parks and Seashore.
I hope that we can agree to protect our resources without restricting human use to such an extreme degree.
Thank you for allowing me to comment.
Sherry Waller Nags Head, NC

Correspondence ID: 12072 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Moore, Keith
Received: May,09,2010 20:15:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Murray,
I, Vacation at the Outer Banks for two weeks during the summer. I have a wife and three children. Together with two other families we come, enjoy and pump a lot of money into the local econmy. We rent sound front and spend our days enjoying the sailing and paddling that brings us here. Please be very thoughtful in your decision to limit access to these activities!
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, Keith Moore

Correspondence ID: 12073 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:18:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12074 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,09,2010 20:18:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 With oil spilling out of the Gulf and soon killing off all life down in the gulf and maybe along the eastern seaboard maybe we can try and protect once left of our natural resources.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12075 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:19:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: FIX THIS PROBLEM NOW~~~!!!

Correspondence ID: 12076 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Consider this quote from Margaret Mead: "It was not until we saw a picture of the earth, from the moon, that we realized how small and how helpless this planet is - something that we must hold in our arms and care for."
 I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors:
 Put Natural Resources First:
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery:

Correspondence ID: 12077 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:19:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 12078 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:19:23
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: 12079 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:19:29
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: 12080 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: nichols, william
Received: May,09,2010 20:19:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: NO ORVS IN NATIONAL PARKS!!

Correspondence ID: 12081 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:23:29
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: 12082 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: (1) After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Poaition Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. (2)I disagree with the extreme buffers outlined in DEIS pages 121 to 127. They must be modified to substantially reduce the minimum 1,000 meter buffer in all directions required in Alternative F for unfledged Piping Plover chicks. Dare County believes a more appropriate and yet effective buffer is 200 meters. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. (3) I agree with the Coalition for Beach Access position statement on the DEIS. I do not believe the DEIS adequately addressed the cultural significance of access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.
Respectfully yours, Kathleen A. O'Connell

Correspondence ID: 12083 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:28:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I wish to enter my comments in the public record on the DEIS. The purpose of the NPS is to preserve and protect the parks and wildlife of the National Seashore. That being said, where is the justification of taking the lives of one species to protect another? The NPS are eradicating any predators to the birds and turtles such as raccoons, foxes, minks, ghost crabs, etc. which are native to the Outer Banks. What gives them this right? I would think anyone such as the special interest groups, Audubon and others who are trying so hard to protect the birds would also take offense to this killing spree. The people, wildlife, birds and turtles have co-existed many years without interference from those who feel the need to put excessive restrictions in order to provide greater nesting areas for birds, who have proven by action, that the presence of people far greater protect them rather than hurt them. Case in

point. One cold night as my husband and I were fishing, a small bird came up and sat on a five gallon bucket between us in order to be near the lantern we had to stay warm and then proceeded later to get in the camper shell on the back of the truck with me for warmth. We also had a pelican come up one day and act as if it had an injured wing and would come up to us begging for fish. After giving it one or two, it then proceeded to walk normally back up by the dunes to sit and sleep as it's stomach was full! The birds are also nesting close to occupied areas such as the schools in order to feel protected from predators. Are these the actions of birds that feel threatened by people? Greater threats to these birds and turtles are storms, tides, other unpreventable acts and special interest groups. I support the Coalition Position Statement rather than the DEIS alternatives in regard to the amount of closures needed to protect the birds in questions and for the sea turtles nests and hatchlings. Our Outer Banks have always been a treasure to many who come from many States in order to be able to sit by the ocean and enjoy family time, fishing or just enjoy God's country. The areas that have allowance for ORV's are not interfering with any cottages, villages or pedestrians. For those of us who love to fish, those who are physically challenged and unable to walk any distance and those whose financial situation does not allow for spending the amount it costs to rent cottages close to the ocean, driving on the beach is their only option. Please do not take this special and treasured advantage away. The present closures are having too much of a negative impact on visitation to the Outer Banks and the economy of the island. I love the Outer Banks and have always called it my home away from home. I am hopeful for Open Access when the final management plan is enacted.

Correspondence ID: 12084 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:33:41
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. With best wishes, Karen Melican

Correspondence ID: 12085 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Pihl, Stacy
Received: May,09,2010 20:36:16
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.

All in all, is it really necessary for ORV traffic on the beach. The wildlife are so limited in their territory, what is the purpose in taking away more of it, limiting them even less. Please reconsider your stand on this matter.

Correspondence ID: 12086 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:37:49
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:	12087	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 20:37:54						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	All vehicle traffic must be severely limited to preserve the pristine environment & minimize the disruptions to birds/animals who call this area home.						
Correspondence ID:	12088	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	moyer, marcy						
Received:	May,09,2010 20:40:34						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please keep off road vehicles out of the Cape Hatteras wild areas, out of its parks, off of its beaches - We will no longer go to Cape Hatteras if off road vehicles are allowed!!! They will damage fragile ecosystems, scare away and disturb nesting birds and other wildlife. Please remember that the general population is becoming older and likes peace and quiet, so you will be catering to a few people and chasing away many (probably much wealthier) tourists and cause unnecessary damage!						
Correspondence ID:	12089	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 20:44:41						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	The noise tht we have o endure in cimilization is not appropriate for the open natural beauty fo the coastal refuges and parks. Off road interfere with the ability to experience nature and the natural world at at slower and more relaxing pace. Bicycles, and heman power is one thing . but motorized vehicular traffic is an unnecessary intrusion into the experience of the natural world and nature. Please do not allow the aarea to be overrun with motorized machines . Peolpe need to get out and walk in nature not subdue it. Sincerely, Steve D McArthur						
Correspondence ID:	12090	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Worthley, Cynthia K						
Received:	May,09,2010 20:46:07						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please do not allow offroad vehicles to use the shoreline for their recreational purposes. This erodes the land, causes habitat (both animal and plant life) to become endangered.						
Correspondence ID:	12091	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 20:48:31						
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:	12092	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 20:48:31						
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: 12093 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gore, Jesse L
Received: May,09,2010 20:49:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Keep vehicles of the coastline and beaches of CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE

Correspondence ID: 12094 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:49:20
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: 12095 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:49:20
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: 12096 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:49:20
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: 12097 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:49:26
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: 12098 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:49:26
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: 12099 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:49:26
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: 12100 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 20:51:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a resident of Hatteras Island. I teach school at Cape Hatteras Elementary School and my husband is the owner/operator of a charter boat. I am writing in reference to the proposed beach closings on Hatteras Island and Ocracoke Islands. The Alternative "F" which is the preferred option of the National Park Service is entirely too restrictive. Please understand that I do care about the wildlife of my precious island. However, when the proposed plan is not based on scientific findings or information about the wildlife and it has the potential to affect the fragile economy of the island, I must speak out against the proposed plan. I disagree that any piping plover unfledged chick brood requires 1,000 meter closure in all directions. This has not been based on any scientific findings. Seven hundred and seventy-one acres per brood is preposterous. Furthermore, the plan calls for 300 meters in all directions for American Oystercatchers, which are not a federally threatened species. These huge restrictions not only affect my beach access but the thousands of tourist who come to Cape Hatteras National Seashore so they do not have to be elbow to elbow with other beach-goers. If tourist cannot enjoy the beach here, then they will take their vacations and their money elsewhere. I disagree with the socio-economic data and analyses of alternative "F". The findings are incomplete and erroneous. The result is an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the island. Since my husband runs a charter boat, my family depends on strongly tourism. No beaches equals no tourist. The economical impact of the beach closings will have a devastating effect on the families and working people of the island. Finally, the alternative "F", intends to protect sea turtles. Hatteras Island has the largest closures with the lowest production of sea turtles of any beach in the US. In Florida, turtle production is higher, yet they do not have huge fines and closures protecting the nests. In places other than Cape Hatteras National Seashore, nests are routinely relocated to more secure areas to maximize the production. This should become the practice of the park on the island as well. Closing huge tracts of beach is not the answer. In closing, the wildlife plays an important role on our island but if the humans are unable to share the habitat with the animals, Hatteras Island will collapse as a community. I love Hatteras Island with all my heart, every part of it from its unequalled beauty to the people and culture. I hope that the National Park Service will not support a management plan that will bring about the end to life on Hatteras Island as we know it.

Correspondence ID: 12101 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: McCulloch, Keith
Received: May,09,2010 20:52:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I disagree with the amount of pedestrian and ORV closures. There is a HUGE amount of land here on the barrier island of North Carolina that never even get touch by humans. Closing down a very small percentage of the land used by humans will have little impact on the birds but a big impact on the people. NPS has lost its way.. this is a recreation area not a bird sanctuary. Pea Island just up the road is the bird sanctuary and portsmouth island, carrot island and all the other uninhabited island on the outer banks serve as a vast area for the birds. closing down cape point, hatteras inlet and ocracoke inlet will have no effect to help the bird population, if anything the predators will have a feild day out there without humans around. The NPS is really just folding to the special interest groups and not sticking to its original mission.
I disagree with closing down ORV use areas. Why stop someone from driving near the beach (not on dune)? where is the sceince and data showing that it is harmful to anyone or anything?? The DEIS states "conflicts between motorized and non motorized users" huh? has the person who wrote that even been here? In 10 years there has only been 1 minor incident involving a stuck vehicle and pedestrian. There are plenty of pedestrian only area in front of all the villages were the people are.. why restrict beach driving?
I disagree with the closure due to birds. The data shows that HUMANS are not the problem. Science shows that Human interference is an "Insignificant Impact" . Look at the data, 54% loses due to predation. (which i predict will go up without humans in the area. which we already saw happen at ramp 34 last year) and 29% of loses are due to mother nature's storms and high tides. Come on.. look at your own data!
I disagree with Closing the beach to Pets. There is no data showing that pet on the beach is disruptive to the birds. If anything pets on the beach will certainly keep away predators, therefore keeping the birds safe.
DEIS 800 pages with only paragraphs that talk about cultural resources? while the purpose of the DEIS is to "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" first sentence of the first page on the plan!! what happened to "traditional use and cultural practices" by long term residents of the local community. Completely ignored?
I disagree with the DEIS Socioeconomic Analysis. Bad data yeilds, Bad conclusion. The DEIS got it wrong in several areas. 1.) the statistical definition of the ROI is incorrect. 2.) the visitation/business survey data is wrong 3.) wrong recreational user data 4.) inflated beach use seashore counts 5) flawed maintenance assumptions. all this incorrect data is used to understate the real impact of the closures on the community.

Correspondence ID: 12102 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 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,
Toni Louwagie

Correspondence ID: 12103 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 21:01:59
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: 12104 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lane, Larry
Received: May,09,2010 21:02:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

I strongly disagree with the proposal that alternative F is the best for the socio-economic advancement of Dare County or the wildlife and fauna that it is suppose to protect. The proposed closures are entirely too restrictive and reflect a strong bias toward broad brush closures. I have been a ORV user of the beaches in this area from the VA line to Portsmouth Island for over 45 years and have not observed the impacts outlined in the DEIS.

More specifically the broad closures of the Hatteras Inlet, OI, and Bodies Island spits are an overt reaction that are not based on proper research and fact.

More importantly, there is overwhelming evidence that nesting is more impacted by predators than by vehicle traffic.

The DEIS is not objective and is strongly biased toward a broad band closure management strategy as opposed to a balanced and reasonable approach.

The current DEIS is more restrictive than the current consent degree and will NOT result in improved nesting success.

I strongly urge that this draft be discounted and re-written with the proper due diligence, research, and involvement of the key community stakeholders.

The strategy outlined by the draft will NOT provide reasonable assurance that the environment will be improved and will result in destroying the economy of the area. The average visitor enjoyment will also be destroyed by the drafts strategy.

I also include the below post and support the author's position on each and every detail regarding the current DEIS.

Copy of Post by Bob Eakes

May 6, 2010

Mr. Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954

Dear Superintendent Murray,

Having been a conservationist most of my life and having received numerous awards for same including a Vice Presidential Award from then Vice President Al Gore along with other awards including one from Audubon I think I am about to become something other than a conservationist.

National Park Service has never paid any attention to my community's desire to work with NPS much less recognized our community effort to work with those of differing views. I attempt one more time that which is quite impossible, bringing my point of view to this issue.

The DEIS is a major failure. Years of preparing for this moment and NPS does not even have the integrity to bring forth a plan which both provides resource protection and provides for recreational access. The DEIS greatest flaw comes from its bias and its very weak attempt to rationalize a position of non access through resource management. There are so many failures in the DEIS that it is just simpler to list same than try, yet again, to explain and argue against them.

The public meeting process was very poorly handled. No outreach or education was offered to my community and most were not qualified to respond to 900 or so pages of the DEIS. I do not understand why someone like Dr. Bert Frost, Associate Director of NPS, could not come down and explain the points of view of the DEIS to the public. After all, he has attended every meeting in Washington, DC on this issue where I have been in attendance.

Obviously he is well versed in the promises made by past directors and secretaries of interior. I hope it is well noted that after all of these years of hearing about the so called other side of this issue and how many people are upset and complaining about off road vehicle; that the public meeting attendance had almost no participation except for paid environmental lawyers and lobbyist and only a couple of those. Yet, my community was well represented. I know you are smart enough to know that when the paid plaintiffs in the so called consent decree agree with the DEIS then NPS has crossed a line of fairness and equity.

The List:

The Interim Strategy was both approved by NPS and USFWS as a means of progressing through and to the DEIS. This strategy plan was sold to our community as a defense against a lawsuit and would allow NPS and all to participate in a fair plan. Needless to say NEPA, FONSI, Chapter 7, NPS promises, and all the work put into this are worthless.

The Consent Decree was done behind closed doors with no participation by my community. I was not consulted or asked about the consent decree. My recommendation was not to sign. Repeatedly the CHNS communication's person has stated that all is well and everybody happy with the consent decree. After all, everyone signed off on it. Not one soul is happy on Hatteras Island about the consent decree. The penalty provision of the decree is ridiculous and presumes my community is guilty and punishable for all resource closure violations. That NPS enforcement has had no effect and made little or no effort to catch the perpetrators of consent decree violations simply enhances the chances that the perpetrators are either environmentalist or NPS personnel. Not one resource violation under the consent decree has harmed the resource in any manner according to you, the superintendent.

Negotiated Rule Making was a failure. My community, many times over, came to the negotiating table only to find that the plaintiffs in the consent decree could not comment because they were in litigation (they should have been replaced). When the plaintiffs finally had their way with the consent decree and us, they simply would not participate in a meaningful discussion. Over and over again and again we met only to waste our time. To finally get to the DEIS and have it presented as coming from reg neg is an affront and an insult. The vast majority did not approve the position the DEIS has taken and only yet again it was manifested by the plaintiffs. Other criticisms of the reg neg process came on the very weak and often times influenced professional speakers who gave their renditions on birds and so on. I can hear most of it right now, "turtle hatchlings whose nest are moved appear to be less vigorous than unmoved turtle hatchlings". Of course a non moved nest which floods and kills all the hatchlings will have even less vigorous turtles than one moved. It is really poor management of the ESA to allow the states to manage turtles while killing thousands of unhatched eggs. Again, it was transparent that banning access was the desire of NPS and hence most of the presenters had real problems coming up with excuses to do so. A stumbling bunch they were.

NPS legal counsel argued throughout reg neg a very resounding defense of why access would and should be denied. Every consultation and question

came back with the same answer: sorry, we have to close Hatteras Island. Again, the repetitiveness from the solicitors only highlighted the bias and did not help reach any accord. The current director, Mrs. Obama the President's wife, executive orders on making recreational fishing sustainable, and every other positive about recreational fishing just made no difference.

The enabling legislation which was decades after the Organic Act is very clear that recreation is the main function of this recreational area. I find it amazing that NPS takes an old act and uses it to supersede what congress wanted and intended. The concept of preserving for future generations public resources would mean a desire to protect cultural and historical use both recreational and other for this area. The DEIS again brings none of this discussion forward. In the enabling legislation were grave concerns and promises made about commercial fishing since it was the only method the islanders had for making a living and so protections were offered. If interpreted correctly, the concerns were for the local citizens to be afforded protection in order to make a living but of course today NPS only looks at commercial fishing and their misinterpretation and their closures do not even take in commercial fishing access.

The traditional use of the beach and seashore is being completely ignored. While the DEIS tries to give a very mundane oversight of transportation use through out the 1940's and up to today, it fails. CHNRA was one of the very first surf fishing Mecca's in the world. The photo of the guys on the front of the DEIS has a picture of my father and friends with red drum caught just after World War II. The traditional use of the beach to fish and recreate was and is history. Hunting shorebirds for profit and recreation was also a part of that history. Long before NPS began trying to manage and close the beach the locals were profiting from taking visitors to hunt and fish and to also furnish the same visitors with food and lodging.

Promises made by NPS are simply worthless. Past directors, secretaries of interior, regional directors, superintendents, and even the present director's desires are worthless to the bureaucrats in NPS. I have had promises from a great many of you that this process would be fair and above board and it is not. There are many in NPS who should be publicly censured and fired. Pink slips given and not simply transferred to another park but retirement funds taken away, health insurance canceled, and pay checks stopped because this is what my community is suffering. To think that I helped sell my community on promises from you and the director about fairness is just a joke.

The Protocols were written for a superintendent who was only trying to cover his liabilities. The protocols do not factor in a balancing act between recreational access and resource protection and they also do not take economics into account. The protocols were promoted from within local NPS by NC Audubon and recommended upward and onward by the weakest of weak resource managers. His incompetence is the reason for regulations today. When the protocols writer Dr. Irwin spoke at reg neg I asked the question of why ESA restrictions were being enforced on non listed species and he replied he just did not know why. This appears to be the first time ever. While little effort has been made to take a realistic look at the protocols the defense of same by NPS has come many times over. Sandy Hamilton, plan writer, stated she had peer reviewed the protocols (like she is qualified) and this sort of sums up the problem we all have with the protocols. Influenced and written by the plaintiffs and never peer reviewed.

North Carolina's position is in support of our community. Both the NC Wildlife Resources Commission and the NC Marine Fisheries Commission with minor reservation are in support of the access point of view. This may surprise some who attended reg neg but the position stated by the biologist from NCWRC was his own and not the formal position by the state. I find it highly disturbing that NPS places such a high priority on the species of concern list generated by North Carolina while the state does not. The list is only there for increased monitoring of the species if needed and no further restrictions are recommended or suggested. I also find it disturbing that NPS picks and chooses its species for regulation from the list. There are at least two other species in the seashore which are on the list. One of the species is located at NPS headquarters and nothing is being done to protect it there (Outer Banks king snake). At least put a sign up there to slow down and help a fellow species out. USFWS while playing a role at reg neg, many times over stepped into the arena of recreational punishment. Many of the arguments and renderings made by USFWS were simply assumptions not borne by fact and even sometimes not understood by the renderer. The best example I can give is of Pete Benjamin, local field supervisor, recounting that at least 25% of turtle nest in CHNRA are not found by employees. Even though this was not supported by local NPS turtle experts the argument was still the only reason given for night time driving restrictions. If Benjamin were right, the 50 year goal set for this area of gaining 25 additional nest has been met and we achieved this with no restrictions whatsoever. Again the point of this is he is denying access without proper studies or even using adaptive management processes to achieve the closings.

My Recommendations Are:

NPS should acknowledge that the DEIS is only here to deny access. Predation, storms, and interference by outside monitors and guest are the real reasons for the lack of birding success in the area. The DEIS continues to promote the theory that there are more vehicles on the beach today than ever before. This is just supposition. The bluefish runs in the early eighties had much greater numbers of people and vehicles on the beach. I well remember the nineties with the island's resource manager giving what appeared to be bird watching tours of piping plover nest. Twenty or thirty people with their binoculars and scopes up close and personal to the nest and whoops, we flushed one. Oh well, there is another nest at Hatteras Inlet and maybe we can be more careful. Hurricane charts mirror the decline of plovers in the nineties but these tables are simply discounted in the DEIS. Predators are now being killed by the thousands and one can only imagine the resurgence of ghost crabs and the harm future generations of plovers will face by this menace. The protocols make reference to 25 predators killed the first year of management that this should help increase bird numbers. I wonder if they ever imagined thousands being killed (sort of like mowing your grass). Through out reg neg I listened to the best of my community leaders and most experienced beach users give recommendations which would help increase populations of shore birds in the seashore only to hear these same recommendations discounted until guess what? We are becoming a community of "we don't give a damn" conservationist. What a joke to try to help the birds while Audubon and the rest of the environmentalist sit silent. They were not at reg neg to help the resource but to close the beaches.

1. Develop an average of closure buffers after the plan been approved. Until such time as an ARM study can be done utilize the access buffers offered by the access lobby. Surely NPS will have the desire and need to enforce these buffers on other parks and recreational areas. Objective viewing of the birds and their reaction to intrusion by either pedestrian or vehicle shows without question the suggested buffers under alternative F to be vastly too large. Any unbiased person can walk up to an American oyster catcher and note that it is not disturbed until only a few meters away. The same scenario happens while driving slowly past. The number 1, 2, and 3 nesting sites for least terns in this county are on the roofs of various department and grocery stores. Least tern populations are going up year after year and they seem content to nest amongst us. Why the great penalty?

2. Bird Populations should be managed by area. I well remember the hysteria brought forth by the plaintiffs about black skimmers being extinct in CHNRA. Oh my God, guess what? They simply moved 500 yards off and on to a spoil site just off the sound in Hatteras. Last year there were 500 or more nest of black skimmers on the north end of Hatteras Island which were not included in NPS reports. If NPS is going to succumb to the lies and hype of the environmental lobby; at least try to manage with some kind of honesty.

3. Turtle management should be maintained by NPS. The great amount of nest lost to water emersion is unacceptable to my community and leads only to questioning why local managers of NPS would listen to one biologist from the state when such vast numbers of eggs are being destroyed. I grow really tired of even worrying about the credibility of NPS. Many years lost eggs account for 50% of the total laid eggs and last year's 37% is a disgrace. The state of South Carolina with a much greater number of nests too manage lost 7% last year. The only clear reason I see for the present management is the bias of the state biologist against vehicle use. By the way, this same biologist did a study (the grant was worth hundreds of thousands of dollars) which showed that moving the nest caused the hatchlings to be less vigorous in his opinion. Of course a dead egg is even less vigorous than a moved egg. It is just ridiculous.

4. Night time restrictions are again not founded in science but simply in mixing assumptions and then using the mix for a rule. For example, 70% of all turtle nest are in non vehicle areas already. Therefore 30 nest are in vehicle areas and 15 of these will be moved. All of this nighttime closure for the 15 nest out of the 56,000 plus east coast turtle nest. Alternative F recommends night time closure one month before turtles arrive and 3 months after they quit nesting. This is just not acceptable. Not allowing campfires on the open beach but allowing campfires in front of the first row of village rental cottages smacks of pay offs for those same few owners who lobbied for both vehicle and pedestrian access restrictions. The very most basic study of false turtle crawls in closed, open, and village area show no justification for nighttime closure. After all, there never has been a turtle or nest harmed in the area by vehicle nighttime traffic (NPS has no study on use). All of the assumptions made are just that, assumptions.

5. Flexibility is not being shown in the DEIS. The flexibility for future managers shown in the interim strategy is not shown here. The future will close vast areas to all even though those areas may change and have little benefit to the birds. Today areas are closed which could be open and much criticism of NPS alleviated yet those areas are closed because of inflexible buffers.

6. I find no discussion about "take" in the DEIS. Realizing that the DEIS was written with the predetermined thought process of a no take seashore, the lack of this discussion surprises me. I know this seashore cannot be managed without a provision for take. For all the failures of the consent decree and all the animosity created by NPS, there has been no take in this seashore since the interim strategy was created according to the superintendent.

7. The disabled, old, and infirm will pay a great price for the DEIS. Local NPS has neither studies nor inclination to understand its customers and users. Interpreters and managers do not get involved with the public. Sure the fee gathering spots such as the Cape Hatteras Lighthouse and Wright Memorial or even the campgrounds may be easy places to generate information but the beach user is not studied. This does not surprise me since upper management is never seen on Hatteras or Ocracoke Island. There will be a grave injustice done to the handicapped under the DEIS.

8. The economic study done for NPS is a travesty. The consternation shown throughout reg neg by the hired economist was the same as that of many of the so called professional presenters. They were asked to develop a study which shows no harm. I personally had to lay off 25% of my staff and have now lost over a million dollars in sales because of consent decree restrictions. This amount will increase under the DEIS since it is even more restrictive. Note that Hatteras Island's recession started with the consent decree and not when the rest of the country's recession started. I also grow weary of hearing about how hard this is on NPS. There is not an employee in NPS who has lost a nickel over the consent decree or a night's sleep. The economic harm will be and is in the hundreds of millions of dollars to Dare and Hyde County.

9. Change the name from: Cape Hatteras National Recreational Area to The Cape Hatteras Special Interest Group Area - National Audubon Only Birds Area!

Sincerely yours,

Bob Eakes, President Red Drum Tackle Shop, Inc. PO Box 1354 Buxton, NC 27920

Correspondence ID: 12105 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 21:03:32
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: 12106 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Salazar, Joe
Received: May,09,2010 21:10:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep off road vehicles out of Cape Hatteras National Seashore! The beauty of this national monument should not be destroyed by dirty, polluting automobiles.

Correspondence ID: 12107 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gover, Pat and Gary
Received: May,09,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
We appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, we support the "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, which should be modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must 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: 12108 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,09,2010 21:17:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Why should we need to comment on the off road vehicle management. Your the National Park Service you are suppose to protect these areas. The only ORV management plan that should take place is one of elimination. Why place our wildlife in greater danger. People come to enjoy the beauty not destroy it. Please do not allow further endangerment of our endangered sea turtles and shorebirds. There are so many areas for people to ride off road why do it in these fragile areas. DO NOT ALLOW OFF ROAD VEHICLES ON THE SHORE.

Correspondence ID: 12109 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,09,2010 21:18:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12110 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 21:19:22

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: 12111 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 21:19:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

Correspondence ID: 12112 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 21:19:22

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: 12113 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Major, Roy F
Received: May,09,2010 21:21:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Our goal goes beyond "climate" We need clean and safe energy everywhere,not to mention the prevention of noise pollution.

Correspondence ID: 12114 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Smith, Sharon D
Received: May,09,2010 21:21:22
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: 12115 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 21:23:58
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: 12116 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Keenan, William D
Received: May,09,2010 21:27:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been a home owner @ 27241 Dory Road Salvo, N.C. since 1984 and I would like to continue to enjoy the beauty of Cape Hatteras with my wife,three daughters and grandchildren. Please consider everyone and their rights and the results of your action on their life as they continue to try to make a living in these difficult times. I have been visiting this area for nearly 40 years and have always respected and obeyed the state and federal laws of the land as I feel most people do. I am not a member of a group other than a natural born citizen that works hard for a living and pays taxes and is

willing to work with others to achieve a common goal. I would like to see all the energy I have seen on this front put into a positive effort such as replacing the Bonner bridge, but that is another story. Please do the right thing to be fair to all concerned that love Cape Hatteras. Sincerely, William Keenan

Correspondence ID: 12117 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, Janer Carper
Received: May.09,2010 21:28:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It would be a travesty to allow off road vehicles onto the beaches at Cape Hatteras. I have seen vehicle traffic on other U.S. beaches such as Daytona and it completely spoils that natural feel of the beach. Vehicle traffic would also introduce more pollution not only in the air but from any liquids or oils dripping from engines, not to mention noise pollution and safety hazards. The beach is a place of relaxation, enjoyment, and inspiration--whether by walking, boating, surfing, sunbathing--it's not a race track. Please spare this magnificent stretch of American coastline from such a devastating ruin. Thank you, Janet Carper

Correspondence ID: 12118 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Pinkus, Walter H
Received: May.09,2010 21:28:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am very concerned by comments I have read that vehicles driving on the Cape Hatteras beaches are significantly destroying turtle and bird nests in and under the sand they are driving on. Personally, I have no sympathy for ORV operators' desire to drive on sensitive beach habitat. The birds, turtles and other animals that use the beaches for nesting and other habitat activities should have first priority and should be protected from any and all interference. After that, I enjoy vacationing on beaches and have visited Cape Hatteras several times. I do not appreciate trying to use a beach that I have to "share" with vehicular traffic. Therefore, I am unhappy that there are comments saying that ORV's are being given preference in beach use. That just is not right.

Correspondence ID: 12119 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Armstrong, John
Received: May.09,2010 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 John,
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: 12120 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Garloch, Jason
Received: May.09,2010 21:42:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been going to Hatteras for years. My mother was born in Manteo, NC and still lives in state. Please reconsider establishing this ORV plan. There are too many unintended consequences of disturbing the wildlife, especially the sensitive vegetation of the Outer Banks that prevent beach erosion and provide a habitat for unique species. This plan is poorly written, completely misguided, a terrible misappropriation of protected lands, and an unnecessary risk to a national resource; beauty! Please hear the people and so do not proceed with such a disregard for the environmental future of the Outer Banks.
Moreover, you must consider the effects on the people visiting by noise pollution. I lived in Rocky Mount, NC for 10 years and remember how loud and smelly ORV's can be. Poorly maintained ORV's wreak of gasoline odors and sound like Biker Week in Daytona. People go to the Outer Banks to escape

the hassle and bussle of more commercialized beach vacation spots. All thngs considered please kill this proposal and think as well as act responsibly.

Correspondence ID: 12121 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 21:44:16
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.
Sincerely, Jenny Clark

Correspondence ID: 12122 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 21:48:35
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: 12123 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 21:48:35
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: 12124 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Monson, Todd
Received: May,09,2010 21:52:22
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: 12125 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Roemer, Megan
Received: May,09,2010 21:58:28
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. Thankyou considering this issue carefully.

Correspondence ID: 12126 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Roth, David
Received: May,09,2010 21:59:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association, a supporter of national parks, and a frequent visitor to the 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. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

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

Correspondence ID: 12127 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Goetz, Kate G
Received: May,09,2010 22:02:51
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: 12128 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Abel, Jerian

Received: May.09,2010 22:03:03

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.

Sincerely,
Jerian Abel

Correspondence ID: 12129 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Burch, Paul

Received: May.09,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

I am currently a homeowner on Hatteras Island have been visiting Cape Hatteras National Seashore for over 25 years. I agree that there needs to a predictable and fair plan for accessing our beaches. There are several items that need to be addressed that will help provide a balanced and reasonable plan to protect and provide access to our national seashore shores.

- 1) Large, inflexible buffers (p.121-127). These buffers that are being considered in the DEIS of 1,000 meter buffer in all directions for the piping plover is to large to allow a balance of human use of the seashore as stated in the original "Park Enabling Legislation". The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such large closures and these extremely large buffers are not used in other federal and state areas for the piping plover! A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters
- 2) Non-endangered species, such as American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Water birds are given Pre-Nesting closures and buffers up to 300 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300 meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters
- 3) Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open area that would otherwise be blocked. In alternative F Corridors are only allowed in ML-2 portions of SMA's and are subject to resource closures at any time. In a more reasonable approach Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMA's. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources
- 4) Turtle Management (Pg.125, 392-396) DEIS claims North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission turtle guidelines will be followed. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas and this would allow better access to beach areas for visitors enjoyment and night driving and fishing.
- 5) Prohibition of Pets (p136) in the seashore during bird breeding season, including in front of the villages. No pets in public areas, beaches, campgrounds, sound-front, foot trails, park maintained roads from March 15 -July 31 The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science supporting that such a ban on pets would have any positive impact on the breeding birds over the current rules of pets on 6ft leash.
- 6) Year Round Closures: Hatteras Inlet, North End Ocracoke Island, Ramp 27-Ramp 30 (Salvo) are set to be closed year round to ORV, I am most familiar with the Hatteras inlet area and this area does not have the characteristics of prime habitat for the plover and the other supposed reason for the closure was the need for a pedestrian only area. It would not be economically or environmentally feasible to pave "pole road" and create parking lots in a beautiful and natural setting at the Hatteras Inlet. The need for pedestrian only areas is addressed in adjacent 15 miles of beach on Pea Island, which never gets included in the amount of beach for pedestrian only and is also a wildlife refuge.
- 7) Economical Impact: the negative economical impact of the "consent decree" has been profound and well documented. Any projected financial losses from these changes will only affect the businesses that are on Hatteras and Ocracoke islands and the impact studies should reflect that and not be spread across the region to lessen the negative financial impact on the villages.

Regards
Paul Burch

Correspondence ID:	12130	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Garvey, Lydia						
Received:	May,09,2010 22:11:05						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	NIX ORVs st Cape Hatteras! It's highly inappropriate to allow noisy polluting destruction , esp. to rare birds & sea turtles. Do your job-Protect Our Public lands, waters & wildlife! Your attention to his most urgent matter would be much appreciated by all present & future generations of all species. Thank you Lydia Garvey Public Health Nurse						
Correspondence ID:	12131	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."</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, Liz Ritter</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12132	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 22:15:58						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Every year for at least 15 years now we have been making a pilgrimage to the Outer Banks, for us it is a place of refuge, recreation, relaxation and restoration. Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure that must be preserved but there must be a balance between preservation and access. I believe that Alternative F can provide a solution that will benefit all the creatures that live and play there, protecting the beaches while allowing us to enjoy them.						
Correspondence ID:	12133	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 22:18:41						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.</p> <p>This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12134	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 22:19:28						
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: 12135 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,09,2010 22:19:28

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: 12136 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,09,2010 22:19:33

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: 12137 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,09,2010 22:19:33

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: 12138 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray, As a life-long supporter of the National Park system, I strongly, strongly urge you to preserve the Cape Hatteras National Seashore's delicate ecosystem by severely restricting the use of off-road vehicles. When my family vacationed at Hatteras many, many years ago, I loved it; my enjoyment of its pristine beauty is still a fond memory. Its sandy beaches, salt marshes and woods are a critical natural resource for the Outer Banks. I understand that off road vehicles could potentially be given preferential treatment to all other visitor uses of the area, which include family vacationers, birders, and others who enjoy nature. It strikes me that this plan not only is unfair to other visitors, it is also hugely damaging as off-road vehicle use tears up fragile ecosystems, destroying the wilderness and various animal habitats. Other visitor uses have much less significant impact. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points:

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12139 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 22:34:01
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: 12140 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cupples, Amy P
Received: May,09,2010 22:35:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My name is Amy Cupples. I am 30 years old and reside in Altoona, Pennsylvania. I am a member of the NCBBA and have been visiting and vacationing at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore on the Outer Banks of North Carolina literally my whole life. I feel like the wind has been taken out of my sails knowing that someday I may not be able to come to my favorite place on Earth. The Outer Banks is an addiction to me. I need it as much as the air I breathe. It's a place of traditions, family, and being one with nature. Is it true that someday I might not be able to visit the most beautiful, tall black & white tower where my husband proposed to me? Is it true that Hatteras Inlet may be closed year round, the place where my husband & I honeymooned and caught fish together and made new memories? Is it true that I may not be able to bring my dog, Marina, to a place that she loves just as much as me? Is it true that someday my future children will not be able to walk these beaches and build sand castles such as I did while vacationing as a little girl? Is it true that my grandmother's dying wish for her family to congregate at the Outer Banks (her favorite place for family and fishing) to celebrate her life may not be honored due to the plan that may come into effect? This certainly does NOT seem fair. WE are people and WE have rights and freedoms and traditions. Our country is based on traditions and I have the tradition of coming to the Outer Banks every year with my entire family which includes my pet. Do you recognize the effect this will have on the local economy if you do not allow people that live and visit here to bring their pet? There seems to be a lot of bias in the DEIS document. Why do we give rights to some animals but not others? There's more protection for a bird than some government officials and I find it outlandish. Why are we making rules for ALL people instead of punishing those that simply do not follow the rules? The leash mandate of 6 feet for pets is sufficient. As a visitor to this beautiful beach, I always utilize common sense and help to clean the beaches. I also volunteer for the beach cleanups at least twice a year. I believe it is important to preserve this land for its historical and cultural value. Most of those who come here are nature lovers or have a love for the outdoors. They respect the land and everything in it. I know that I come here for the beauty of the ocean, the peaceful beach walks, the intoxicating air and ocean breezes, and the amazement I get looking at the million stars in the night sky. Is it fair that as an American citizen with the same rights and

freedoms as any other American be denied my right to access and recreate in this National Park? Is it fair that every good memory I have exists here and someday I may NEVER be able to make more with my family?

The answer is NO. It is not fair! Please consider my comments and please help me to save my beach!

Sincerely,
Amy Cupples

Correspondence ID:	12141	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 22:45:50						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I am against closing any public lands to "protect" so called endangered species. The waco environmentalist have been closing land all over the country in an attempt to keep people that don't meet with their approval from enjoying the outdoors in a manner that suits them best. Please do not close any more lands to off road vehicles. It would cripple an industry and ruin outdoor adventures for many people if you close any more lands.						
Correspondence ID:	12142	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 22:48:42						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. I want decreased OVR use and OVR FREE zones with a plan for recovery of wildlife and birds as well as zones for breeding, wintering and migrating wildlife with increased buffer zones for protection. Also include followup studies to increase the buffer areas as necessary to protect the wildlife recovery and establishment. Please no expansion of OVR areas, but decrease these areas as our national wildlife is dying. This is important to me and I will be following the progress on this Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
Correspondence ID:	12143	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 23:08:13						
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:	12144	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	Miller, Bob						
Received:	May,09,2010 23:14:44						
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:	12145	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						

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

Correspondence ID: 12146 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 23:21:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I plan on visiting Cape Hatteras later this year and would not be happy to find it ruined by ORV's everywhere. Cape Hatteras is a beautiful place that needs our protection so the wildlife can thrive and be there for generations to come. Allowing ORV's would be counterproductive to the welfare of this environment. Please do not allow them to devastate this gorgeous place. Thank you, Lisa Allen

Correspondence ID: 12147 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 23:33:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Beaches, shorelines, and associated areas (e.g., sand dunes) are natural wonders that everyone can enjoy (both shoreline residents and shoreline visitors/vacationers).
 Besides the "draw" of the pounding waves and surf, people visit beaches to see wildlife and sometimes to experience silence and solitude. Vehicles and ATVs can absolutely ruin the idyllic setting of a beach, and off road vehicles should be BANNED.
 Gary Drescher

Correspondence ID: 12148 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,09,2010 23:33:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I urge you to 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: 12149 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 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.
 ORV use ought not to be privileged over protection of the wilderness, birds and turtles. The woods, beaches and salt marshes must be preserved for wildlife and people, not for ORV use.
 Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12150 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Russell, Laura M
Received: May,09,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No Vehicles!

Correspondence ID: 12151 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 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. It is particularly critical that this area be carefully protected at a time when bird and sea turtle populations are under duress as a result of the oil leak in the Gulf of Mexico. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12152 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Horne, Jenifer
Received: May,09,2010 23:42:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Respectfully,
Jenifer Horne

Correspondence ID: 12153 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,09,2010 23:48:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID:	12154	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 23:49:45						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12155	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,09,2010 23:53:53						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	all life deserves respect.						
Correspondence ID:	12156	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,09,2010 23:58:43						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12157	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,09,2010 23:58:54						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <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 is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						

Correspondence ID: 12158 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Rekdal, Sheila K
Received: May,10,2010 00:03:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off road vehicles are annoying not only to the peace and serenity of the area, but also destructive to the flora and fauna of the area. There is a need for quite places...places that one can go to unwind and not be blasted by the god awful noise of ATV's.

Correspondence ID: 12159 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:11:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.
Please don't take away one of the most historic places in the country.

Correspondence ID: 12160 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.
We have coexisted with the wildlife in this region for hundreds of years. Please afford us the opportunity to continue to do so safely.
I also suggest that if necessary, force drivers to buy a permit and attend a class on ORV use each year. I would gladly pay to have this done to support proper and fair conservation of the beaches. This would satisfy proper education on safe driving and use of the beaches and what to do if endangered wildlife are sighted.

Correspondence ID: 12161 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:17:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I cannot believe that any management would heedlessly ignore the primary objective of the park to maintain the pristine natureal beauty and threaten the stability of the beaches by allowing any even somewhat restrained use of vehicles. We must be concerned with the protection these beaches. Any rash decision that harms or destroys them could cost us their beauty forever.

Correspondence ID: 12162 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Alvarez, Vincent M
Received: May,10,2010 00:18:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Access to these beautiful areas should be limited for ORV. I was nearly run down last year when I was walking on the beach enjoying the waves and views. A maniac on an ATV roared over a dune barely missing me. He then yelled at me, flipped me off and roared off at high speed. Since when did access to our Natural treasures require that we allow ORV's? If you want to enjoy these areas, walk!

Correspondence ID: 12163 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:18:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12164 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:18:47
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: 12165 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:19:44
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: 12166 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Daly, Charles
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of our national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (O.R.V.) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege O.R.V. use over all other visitors. The reason for this I cannot even begin to comprehend. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize these following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot and should 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 of Americans and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (O.R.V.s), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not O.R.V. use. It is absolutely essential that the N.P.S. protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow O.R.V. use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/Environmental Impact Statement must assert N.P.S. authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final O.R.V. management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12167 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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 protect this area for all of us to enjoy for many generations to come, and not let it be damaged by these ORV's.

Correspondence ID: 12168 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Davis, William R
Received: May,10,2010 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. Ban all ORVs is the nice, simple answer. Why should a bunch of idiots in ORVs be allowed to terrorize everyone else on our beaches and destroy the coastlines?
The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. The policy should be reversed 180 degrees: Screw ORVs!
Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Ban all ORVs!
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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 should be an investigation into who benefits from ORV sales ... probably some already too rich jerk-offs of the corrupt and fascist corporatocracy.

Correspondence ID: 12169 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:48:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12170 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:48:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12171 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:48:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. I also believe that the strongest prevention measures available should be put in place to assure oil production does not result in disaster. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12172 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:49:47
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: 12173 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 01:02:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Cape Hatteras Nat. Seashore is not a place for ORV's! This is a special place where people go to get away from crowds and noise. Not to hear loads ORV's ripping by and tearing up the fragile ecosystem home to a wide variety of fragile plant and animal species.
Please protect this beautiful and quite area from the onslaught of ORV's.

Correspondence ID: 12174 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 01:15:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern please consider other methods before going this route which would ultimately be totally destructive to the habitat of the wildlife present thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12175 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 01:27:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12176 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 01:32:57

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To Whom it May Concern,

I am a semiretired former hi-tech business owner and a full time resident of Kill Devil Hills, NC and now work in Rodanthe from the early spring through late fall teaching kiteboarding. We moved to the Outer Banks three years ago with our daughter to enjoy this unique location. I strongly believe that the highly restrictive proposed beach access plans provide extremely limited, if any environmental benefit in relation to the negative economic impact they will have on an already stressed local economy.

The intent of the national parks and seashore was, and is to provide recreational access to the public while taking a balanced approach to environmental concerns. I believe that the Interim Beach Access Plan that has been in place for numerous years has achieved that goal and that a small minority of environmental extremists are trying to convince the public otherwise. All of my fellow Outer Banks Residents supported the Interim plan. No one that I know living here or visiting here supports the proposed highly restrictive plans. My fellow residents and visitors I meet all want the protect the environment but they also want to be balanced and pragmatic in that effort.

I urge you to support to least restrictive plan that is closest to the previous iterim plan

Regards, Dave Kurtz 224 Sunset Dr Kill Devil Hills, NC 27948

Correspondence ID: 12177 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Le Compte, Becky
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: ear Superintendent Murray,

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12178 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 01:49:17

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: 12179 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 01:49:52

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: 12180 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Taylor, Jennifer R
Received: May,10,2010 01:57:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: PLEASE DON'T LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!

Correspondence ID: 12181 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Clark, Pilar
Received: May,10,2010 02:06:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: May 11, 2010
Mike Murray Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Phone: 252-473-2111, ext 148
Dear Mr. Murray,

After reviewing the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement, it is my understanding that the use of ORVs is necessary for the public enjoyment of the park. However, it seems the park needs to embrace and consider more options of handling the vehicles, so the natural habitats of the area can be undisturbed. There are many good reasoning's for how the continued use of the vehicles can change to protect the park, and make it friendlier to visitors. The section Elements Common to All Alternatives are very good ideas of how to handle the use of the motor vehicles. The enforcement of the use of ORV within the park must be continued and enhanced to create a safe environment for visitors and animals alike. The use of ORV is necessary for the park, and for the visitors as well. I would agree that the use of vehicles should be continued for the convenience of the guests. There are environmental consequences for using the vehicles on the fragile areas of the park. The most important is the overall look of the park, but also the wildlife that have established a habitat within the area. The amounts of endangered species that live within the park are subject to danger while ORVs are in use. I think that the area needs to respect the animals and keep the ORVs away from the habitats as much as possible. Viewing of the natural habitats should be allowed, but by walking rather than driving to held preserve the homes of the animals. Also, it is important that the area of the park be monitored and be aware of the conditions of the area, so the risk of damaging the area and ORVs can be reduced. The park should only be open when days are nice to reduce the amount of traffic and reduce the amount of damage that ill-weathered days may have. It is most important that the vehicles be monitored to ensure there is little damage within the park. Overall, the DEIS of Cape Hatteras is very important so I could know more about the area. It is important for the endangered species and for the well being of the park that the ORVs be designated a route through the park to resemble other parks throughout the country. This will not only reduce the amount of impact cars have upon the beach, but also the limit the impact they have on the habitats of the animals. The DEIS has very many good ideas and suggestions of how to correctly balance the coexistence of the vehicles and the wildlife, while still offering a pleasant place to visit. The history of Cape Hatteras is important for the surrounding area as well for the people who come to enjoy it. However, the well being of the endangered species must all be an important factor of deciding how to correctly deal the vehicles. Without the animals that have made Cape Hatteras a wildlife site seeing area, there is no more park. Sincerely, P. Clark pocxt4@mail.missouri.edu

Correspondence ID: 12182 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 02:11:13

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: we have an impending disaster in the gulf. do we need another one around cape hatteras?

Correspondence ID: 12183 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Revilla Alguacil, Oscar
Received: May,10,2010 03:09:34

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: 12184 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Judelman, Jono
Received: May,10,2010 03:15:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: ORV's are not supposed to be in serene parks like this. Congress designated this area as a park, for wildlife safety and pedestrian access. How, if you introduce ORV's everywhere, can wildlife or pedestrians be safe???
 Another point, wildlife recovery is a major goal, not ORV freedom. These ORV's threaten to derail these recovery plans and I am ashamed to think that Americans are going to lose yet another wild place!
 Please protect our natural places. They are increasingly disappearing and there have been such bad decisions which sacrifice wildlife and nature for short-term human profit and development. Cape Hatteras cannot fall prey to an other bad decision and I beg you to consider my comments and reject ORV's in this special place.
 Thanks.

Correspondence ID: 12185 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 03:19:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12186 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 03:28:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Sir,
 It is incomprehensible that recreational motor vehicles are permitted at all in nature; not to speak of in a National Park area. This must be stopped immediately. Motor vehicles have more than enough roads to drive on. Aside from the obvious disturbance to all other life forms, including humans, it must be absolutely clear now with the overwhelming data on climate change, that the first action to be taken must be to bar all entertainment use of internal combustion engines. Not only would carbon dioxide emissions be significantly reduced, but incentive would be given for sitting less and actually using the human body more for the movement for which it has evolved (the legs are not simply decorative appendages). The increase of human and ecosystem wellbeing would be inestimable, and the catastrophic US health and health care system would benefit immeasurably. Everyone wins.

Correspondence ID: 12187 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 03:37:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep the serenity of the beach!

Correspondence ID: 12188 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 04:19:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been a property owner on Hatteras Island since 1984.
 I would like to note alternative "F" is far too restrictive and unnecessary.

I implore you to consider the coalition's ORV management plan and NOT plan "F".

This is a National Park and recreation area funded by American Taxpayers dollars, for the American People to responsibly enjoy. It is also a natural wildlife area where people and animals co-exist in harmony and always have.

This whole attack on our lives is so insane I can only think this cannot possibly be about the birds, and it's not.

Remember the saying; When bad decisions are made or ones that don't make sense, something else is going on? Usually money.

This is all about certain animal rights groups suing the Govt. using the power of the Endangered Species Act and lining their pockets with millions of taxpayer dollars in the process. I think by now everyone understands this.

Until we modify this Act and remove the incentive for these groups to sue the Govt. this kind of thing will never end. My question is who's next? Maybe your back yard...

Every property owner, resident and business owner is here on the OBX not because it's an easy life but because we love this place exactly as it is and take very personally any abuse of this area with regard to property or wildlife.

Most of us are bird and wildlife lovers and go out of our way to pick up garbage or dangerous items on the beach, call the police or Park service when we see someone breaking rules and help any animal in trouble.

If we fish or hunt we do it responsibly. We take care of our Island. The whole idea that the wildlife is in any kind of trouble here is ludicrous.

Sincerely,

Lee Cortese

14295 Park Dr. Avon, NC 27915

Correspondence ID: 12189 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 04:20:10

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: 12190 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Jaklitsch, Mike

Received: May,10,2010 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 Jaklitsch

Correspondence ID: 12191 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 04:31:59

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.

Perhaps as a middle ground, bicycles can be permitted if they are not already. I hope that a satisfactory resolution is found for the protection of nature. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12192 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 04:36:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think it's indisputable that we, as conscious and responsible humans, should do what we can to protect wildlife in their natural habitat. Dedicating a majority of beach space to vehicles of any kind, be it for work or recreation, simply isn't acceptable -- or necessary.

Correspondence ID: 12193 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 04:50:12
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: 12194 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Herr, Donita
Received: May,10,2010 04:52:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a US 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.
***** 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, Donita Herr

Correspondence ID: 12195 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 04:57:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep Hatteras open for sports, especially non motor sports like kite-boarding, sailing, surfing, kayaking, swimming.

Correspondence ID: 12196 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Singleton, Jonathon
Received: May,10,2010 05:03:32
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: 12197 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Weaver, Andrew C
Received: May,10,2010 05:03:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear National Park Service,

My wife and I are writing to voice our concerns on the Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS for Hatteras Island.

Our family has enjoyed spending summers at this national seashore for more than decade. As residents of Virginia, we have endured the long drive to Hatteras each season because we appreciate the natural beauty of the island, including the wildlife and minimal commercial development.

We agree with the plan's objective of providing additional protections for endangered species like the piping plover in undeveloped areas. We do not agree, however, with the extent of the proposed restrictions, particularly the provisions that would restrict access for pedestrians and pets to the beaches alongside the developed villages, such as Hatteras Village.

It is inherently unjust for the NPS to change the rules regarding beach access for pedestrians and pets in the villages when so many families and businesses have made investments there with the understanding that the beach is the main reason people visit. My family invested a large portion of our life savings to purchase a semi-oceanfront home in Hatteras Village in 2008. The value of the home, and the seasonal rentals it generates, is entirely dependent on access to the beach. Our guests pay sizable weekly rents to walk out our doorstep on to the beach for sunbathing, swimming, kite flying, surf fishing and walking their dogs. (About 15 percent of our guests bring their dogs.)

Thousands of home owners just like us, up and down Hatteras Island, are very concerned that the proposed NPS plan could result in beach closures directly outside our homes. Most of us are entirely dependent on a steady flow of rental income to be able to afford the mortgages on these properties. A loss of beach access, even for 1-2 months a year, would severely disrupt our rental income for the year. In my family's case, we would no longer be able to afford the property and would be forced into foreclosure or a short sale, given that its value would be significantly less than the purchase price due to its reduced rental potential.

I urge you to reconsider this part of the plan and remove all language that would potentially restrict pedestrian and pet access to the beaches in the villages. Any adopted restrictions on ORV and pedestrian access in the undeveloped areas will be hard enough for nearby property owners and businesses to endure. The potential of losing access to the sand and surf directly outside our doorsteps would be financially and emotionally devastating.

Sincerely,
 Andrew Weaver Leesburg VA

Correspondence ID: 12198 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Benson, John
Received: May,10,2010 05:05:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live in Salvo, NC, one of the villages surrounded by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I have made several previous comments concerning my displeasure with the overall DEIS and especially with the NPS preferred alternative. The DEIS as a whole misrepresents the effect that the preferred alternative will have on the quality of life within the villages of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. I have experienced a major reduction in the quality of life here since the NPS started the Negotiated Rulemaking process. I have especially seen the quality of life experience a major decline since the Consent Decree was put into effect. I have seen this major decline in relationships between neighbors, between residents, visitors and NPS personnel, within local businesses, and even within my church. I have personally seen how out of touch the NPS is with the people living within the Seashore and the way NPS actions affect them. The NPS has obviously noticed the negative effect on quality of life of their employees living on Hatteras Island as evidenced by their need to build a fancy recreation center on NPS property for those employees. The NPS must take into consideration quality of life issues when determining beach access restrictions at Cape Hatteras. The major effect these restrictions have should lead the NPS to choose the least possible restrictions rather than the most restrictive.

Correspondence ID: 12199 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Detter, Claudia I
Received: May,10,2010 05:11:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Only one question: What are you thinking? Why would anyone want to possibly ruin such a beautiful area?

Correspondence ID: 12200 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 05:15:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I request that NPS review the proposed turtle management document contained at the below web site and provide rationale for accepting or rejecting each aspect that differs from Alt F.
<http://www.obpa-nc.org/turtles/TurtleMgmtProgram.pdf>

Correspondence ID: 12201 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 05:19:10

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: 12202 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Kamins, Jodie A

Received: May,10,2010 05:22:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: May 10, 2010

As long time visitors to the Outer Banks, homeowners in Rodanthe, NC for 10 years and restaurant owners in Waves, NC for five years, we have a vested interest in and a responsibility to carefully review the plans to manage the resources that comprise and define our community. We appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) addressing beach access and regulating ORVs on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

The issue of beach access involves much more than just folks wanting to drive on the beach. The National Park Service has a responsibility to protect the natural resources and wildlife while simultaneously providing and preserving the public's right to current and future access at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

With that understanding, we see Dare County's recommendations regarding the DEIS as reasonable and achievable. We urge the National Park Service to make changes in their preferred alternative F that incorporate the provisions outlined in Dare County's position statement. These specifically address the following:

- ? CORRIDORS are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources ? MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on peer-reviewed science ?
- NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered ?
- TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation and other practices

These changes will serve the goals of all ? preserving the historical, cultural and recreational gift that has been Hatteras Island since it was established by Congress as a National Seashore.

We believe, as does Dare County and many reputable scientists and citizens, that these changes will be beneficial to the long term success for wildlife, enhance the visitor experience and improve the lives of those living near and visiting the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area by ensuring access while maintain and protecting the fragile resources of these barrier islands.

We are unaccustomed to opposing the efforts of "environmentalists," and honestly wonder why this is the case when our ultimate goals are essentially the same. The science offered to support the environmentalist positions in this case simply does not justify the extreme pedestrian and ORV access restrictions proposed in the DEIS. We cannot support their efforts to pressure the National Park Service into a policy of denying human entry (both pedestrian and ORV) into large areas of the park and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach. There is room for both public use and resource management. Extreme positions benefit no one.

We urge the National Park Service to incorporate into its preferred alternative F the recommendations presented by the Dare County position paper. This will ensure that this stretch of land remains true to its intended purpose and heritage for the wildlife and people who share it.

Respectfully submitted,
Matthew and Jodie Kamins Rodanthe, Hatteras Island, North Carolina

Correspondence ID: 12203 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 05:22:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Outer Banks has a special place in my heart. As a child my family went on vacation in Buxton where we camped and rode on the beaches in my Uncle's old Jeep. We were able to appreciate the beach by riding out to the point and fishing along the coast. These are memories that I have shared with my children. I have introduced my husband and children to the wonderful beach at the Outer Banks and look forward to carrying on the tradition as my children have children. If the access to the beaches are taken away we will not be able to keep this tradition going. Please do not take this adventure away from the many families that have made memories along the Outer Banks Coast.

Correspondence ID: 12204 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 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 O'Shell

Correspondence ID: 12205 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 05:49:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12206 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 05:49:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12207 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 05:49:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

the stability of our biodiverse network.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12208 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 05:50:13
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: 12209 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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 tourists, local families, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches.

All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant, and puts beach-goers in danger. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points: 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.

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

Correspondence ID: 12210 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Brady, Richard
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: "I am a resident of Virginia and a Property Owner in Buxton, NC who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the alternative (#F) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore - i.e. 'no' on NPS alternative.

I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access." - ie. 'yes' on the Coalition for beach Access proposal.

Thank You
Richard A Brady

Correspondence ID: 12211 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Schall, Donna R
Received: May,10,2010 05:57:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please protect Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Don't allow off road vehicles there. Every piece of good public land should be protected now.

Correspondence ID: 12212 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:00:36
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: 12213 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:11:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a resident of North Carolina aged 60 who has utilized the beaches of North Carolina all my life. I very much appreciate the beauty of the beaches and I am as concerned about maintaining them for future generations for the use of all our citizens and visitors. I have been very concerned with the beach closures and limited access by the NPS in recent years which has limited access to the Parks by many of our citizens.
I support reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to our beaches. I also support protection of our birds, sea turtles and other protected species. I have read the various options presented for access and I do not support #7 advanced by NPS, because it is too restrictive.
I support and recommend that the NPS approve and adopt the proposal submitted by the Coalition for Beach Access. It is well thought out, supports access to all our citizens and meets the objectives for protection of our wildlife, but at the same time provides reasonable and acceptable access.
Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 12214 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:11:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern:
My name is Joseph Kavanagh, I am a resident of Frisco, Charter Boat owner/operator, and user and visitor of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.
The purpose of the letter is to make Public Comment on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Draft Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement.
My first comment concerns the fact that the Economic Impact analysis component of the planning process is not completed. This is the single most important component to the planning process and was supposed to be completed for public comment in conjunction with the DEIS. As a local businessman, and park user, without this most important piece of the document, the rest of the DEIS is useless.
The Beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area are our keystone attraction for visitors to our area. Limiting access in any way will have a devastation impact on our local economy, and already has. Without the Economic Impact Analysis components of the planning process, this plan cannot move forward.
The DEIS is largely based upon management of species that are not legally required to have any specific protection in place. These are Non-endangered, Non-Threatened species and there is no legal basis for such large closures based upon these species.
Other species listed by the State of North Carolina as "Species of Concern" have impacted beach access with large closures. The State of North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission has recently come forward and stated that this was not the intent of calling these species "species of concern". These populations are healthy. There is no legal basis for management based on these species.
The proposed closures for piping plovers are too large and inflexible. It has been shown that Plovers do not really need such large buffers for successful nesting.
The National Park Service in drafting the DEIS has failed to consider other areas of the Recreational Area that are not accessible for vehicles as bird areas that are part of this same ecosystem. These include, isolated barrier islands in the sound and ocean, dredge islands, areas of Pea Island and Portsmouth.
The DEIS sets a precedent by manipulating nature in several ways such as Predator control, relocation of turtle nests for weather, set aside for Sea Beach Amaranth and others, but will not manipulate nature when favorable for access by human park users.
In summary, this DEIS sets a management precedent for this Recreational Area to be turned into a nature preserve. This is not the purpose or the intent of a Recreational Area. The Cape Hatteras Recreational Area was created to preserve access to our seashore for all people, not for poorly planned turtle and bird management.
Please consider the humans first in management of MY federal lands.
Thank you for this opportunity to comment.
Sincerely,
Joseph D. Kavanagh, III

Correspondence ID: 12215 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:14:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do what ever can be done to ptoctect Cape Hataris and other shore lines from off road vechile distruction. There are special designated areas that have been provided for this sport that will leave pristine areas off limits!!!! Nedra Wagar

Correspondence ID: 12216 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Winkelmeyer, Ian J
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
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 and one of the most beautiful, protected areas of the Outer Banks. The seashore attracts a range of visitors: fishermen, bird watchers, kite flyers, seashell pickers, surfers, families vacationing, people enjoying the water. Don't get my wrong, I love driving my old Jeep on the beach but, some area's should have restrictions on ORV use. Enough of the beach is already permissible for such use. The national seashore, and the dunes need all the conservation help that they can get. I support the "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to recognize several points: 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence; 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for 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 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.

Correspondence ID: 12217 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:16:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This land should be preserved for wildlife to prosper and grow as it should. People driving their vehicles on this land is not a necessary thing for people to be able to enjoy the beauty of it.

Correspondence ID: 12218 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:17:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 May 9, 2010
Re: Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Draft Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/EIS
Dear Mr. Murray:
This letter is sent to you as a public comment under your draft EIS referred to above.
As a frequent Cape Hatteras National Seashore visitor for many years , I have participated in all but one of the activities cited in the Figure 23 Visitor Activity Survey Results (Page 260). I would like to continue enjoying the recreation at the seashore for the remainder of my years, however I am gravely concerned that the preferred proposed Alternative F will severely impede this. As stated in the Act, Congress established the Seashore in 1937 as a national seashore for the enjoyment and benefit of the people, and to preserve the area. (page iv). Although I agree with the premise of protecting the natural resource, Alternative F would do so at the expense of humans, as well as the local economy and culture. .
Specifically my comments on the proposed plan:
1) I disagree: Page 121. To completely prohibit pedestrian access in sections of the national seashore, runs completely contrary to the basis upon which the Park was founded, for recreation. Pre-Nesting Closures All species: All designated Breeding Shorebird SMAs will be posted as pre-nesting closures using symbolic fencing by Mar 15 at sites involving piping plover, Wilson's plover, and/or American oystercatcher; and by Apr 15 at sites involving only colonial waterbirds. The NPS will determine the configuration of specific pre-nesting closures based on an annual habitat assessment. Pre-nesting closures would be adjusted to the configuration of the Nonbreeding Shorebird SMAs for the respective sites (as described later in this table) if no breeding activity is seen in the area by Jul 31, or 2 weeks after all chicks have fledged, whichever comes later. Pre-nesting closures will not be modified in cases where the beach erodes into the buffered habitat. ORVs, pedestrians, and pets are prohibited within all resource closures, including pre-nesting closures. ML1: SMAs managed using ML1 measures would not allow ORV or pedestrian access when pre-nesting closures are in effect. ML2: The Bodie Island Spit, Cape Point, and South Point Ocracoke SMAs would be managed using ML2 measures in action alternatives C, E, and F. Once pre-nesting closures are implemented at these sites, a narrow ORV access corridor (where ORV use is permitted) or a pedestrian access corridor (where ORV use is not permitted) would be established. Upon the first observation of breeding activity, the standard buffers (please refer to table 11, Shorebird/Waterbird Buffer Summary) will apply, which depending upon the circumstances may close the access corridor. The Bodie Island Spit access corridor would follow the ocean shoreline to the inlet. The Cape Point access corridor would follow the ocean shoreline from ramp 44 south to the point, then west approximately 0.2 mile along the ocean shoreline. The South Point Ocracoke access corridor would follow the ocean shoreline south from ramp 72 to the inlet. Exact configuration of the corridor would be determined by NPS staff based on the annual habitat assessment. The ORV access corridor at ML2 sites will generally be no more than 50 meters wide above the high tide line (alternative E may include a designated pass-through zone where no stopping or recreation would be permitted in order to minimize disturbance). An ML2 pedestrian access corridor would generally be below the high tide line and would in no case be more than 10 meters above the high tide line. Pets, as well as kite flying, ball and Frisbee tossing, and similar activities, will be prohibited in the access corridors or pass-through zones (in alternative E only) while the pre-nesting closure is in effect.
2) I disagree. I find the proposed 1000 meter buffers cited on pages 121 ? 127 unnecessarily restrictive and arbitrary. The use of such large buffers will cause people to be forced into smaller areas, with a subsequent greater impact on resource in the area. In addition, the expansion of the buffers as a punitive measure for infractions is also arbitrary. Please do not punish all for the offenses of one.
3) I disagree. The complete prohibition of ORVs, year round, pp 97-101, is entirely unnecessary, and will also impede human ability to partake of many recreational activities in the stated areas between ramps 27-30, Hatteras Spit, Ocracoke Inlet and others.
4) I disagree. Pets have been part of my, and continue to be part of many visitors' recreation and vacation experience. I disagree with the proposal to completely prohibit pets at the seashore beaches during "breeding season" from March 15th to July 31st. Page 136. Pets on a leash will not interfere with wildlife protection measures.
5) I disagree. It has not been proven scientifically that human interference is extensively responsible for damage to turtles and nesting birds, (less than 3%) so the prohibition against night driving for over half of the year is unnecessarily restrictive. P 104, P 377. No piping plover deaths have been attributable to ORVs.
6) Page 468, I disagree. Access should be provided through all species management areas. Buffers should move with the species, instead of being expanded.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed plan. I look forward to a reasonable resolution of the issues, one that the Park, the Visitors, the natural Resources and the Local Culture and Economy will find reasonable and sustainable.
Sincerely,

Frank M. Harvey

Correspondence ID: 12219 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:17:05
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: 12220 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:19:16
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: 12221 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:19:16
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: 12222 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:19:16
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: 12223 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:19:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12224 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:20:16
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: 12225 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:20:21

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: 12226 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 06:20:22

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: 12227 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 06:23:04

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: 12228 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 06:25:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Thank you for taking time to review my comments on the DEIS. I realize a great deal of work has gone into creating the Alternatives A through F. I have a number of concerns about the Park Service's preferred alternative F.

I disagree with the 1000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for piping plover unfledged chick brood (p. 121-127). As stated in the Virginian Pilot on May 9,2010, "no scientific reasoning" has been presented "for this management strategy." The impact of this rule could cause closures not just in ORV areas but may close the beach in front of houses. The financial impact of visitors renting ocean front/ocean side houses and being unable to walk out on the beach in front of "their house" would devastate Hatteras Island.

I disagree with the 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for any American Oystercatcher nest or brood, as the Oystercatcher is not a

federally threatened species (p121-127). Again, the unnecessary closure of beaches and consequent lack of access to the beach and ocean for pedestrians (and ORVs) is not sensible. I live in on Pamlico (north Avon). Last year the beach was closed directly in front of our house due to Least Tern nesting. As we are the farthest north set of houses we could walk slightly south and still get to the beach, but if buffer areas are extended -- and used for non federally threatened species it is highly likely the beach would be closed in front of ocean front houses that visitors have rented.

I disagree with the Alternative F rule that No pets, including dogs, will be permitted on Cape Hatteras National Seashore lands including the beaches between March 15th and July 31st (p 136). This rule has no benefit for the preservation of birds or turtles. If people are allowed in an area, than a dog on a leash is of no environmental concern. I have heard numerous times from visitors on the island that they come to Hatteras because we are "pet friendly" on the beach. We own an Ocean front home that allows pets. In the spring every week of rental is with visitors with pets. Should this rule be put in place Hatteras Island's spring and summer business will be adversely impacted as individuals will find somewhere else to vacation. Additionally many homeowners have pets and walking on the beach is the only place we have to exercise our dogs. We have very limited sidewalks and no walking trails on Hatteras Island.

I agree that the NPS needs to have a viable management plan for OUR park lands. I encourage all involved to take a balanced approach. Thank you in advance for your review of my comments.

Correspondence ID: 12229 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 06:30:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Enough is enough! We don't need to play with our "toys" everywhere! Think of the wildlife and the environmental impact this will have. We need to show respect for what we have left...please!
Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 12230 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Ammons, Stephen R
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Coastal Conservation Association North Carolina wishes to comment on the recently released Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) on the ORV Management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area (CHNSRA) issued by the National Park Service (NPS). The objective of CCA is to conserve, promote and enhance the present and future availability of these coastal resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the general public. As such the thousands of members and volunteers of CCA NC and their nearly three quarters of a million associated recreational anglers are very disappointed in the six options for ORV management on CHNSRA. First of all the document itself is very difficult to follow in its 800+ pages. The tragedy is that none of the six options reflect the wishes of the vast majority of the CHNSRA visiting public and CCA NC. While there are preferred environmental and NPS options, there is no pro-access preferred option. The CHNSRA was established specifically for the American public to enjoy the seashore. To propose no option which provides a maximum access option certainly violates the spirit and perhaps the letter of the laws establishing this national park. Without serving the visiting public, the NPS has failed in its responsibility to our citizens. All the options presented in the DEIS seek to restrict public access well beyond any reasonable or legal requirement.

It is clear that significant facts have been ignored in the preparation of this DEIS. The success of turtle nesting and piping plover nesting and fledging is virtually unchanged since the de facto ORV plan was implemented in 1978. The primary causes of failed nesting and fledging are overwhelmingly predation and weather events which have occurred for hundreds of years. ORV caused mortality is a fraction of 1%. The USFWS and NPS personnel have caused more plover mortality. Yet, the NPS chooses to attack those users who are very sensitive to the wildlife in the CHNSRA.

The DEIS options all include restrictions which, when implemented as they have been under the consent decree, will unnecessarily close miles and miles of beach access both from the ocean and sound side. The many options describe no action which can circumvent a nesting closure in order to access an open area of the beach. Thus, while a stretch of waterfront may be "open" it is inaccessible. This represents nothing more than verbal trickery and masks the true available waterfront.

The specifics of option F, the NPS preferred option, require at least some comment as commenting on all options would extend beyond the available space and time constraints. Overall, the DEIS suggests there would be 52 of 68 miles of the waterfront "open" to ORV access but it is not clear that this includes any calculation of sound side access for ORVs or pedestrians. CCA NC strongly believes the "buffer" or closure areas suggested for piping plovers in various stages of nesting and fledging are beyond excessive. For nesting piping plovers 50 meters is more than adequate and as is 200 meters for unfledged chicks. To suggest that unfledged chicks of a bird that is less than 1 foot tall requires over a mile of seashore is ludicrous! All this with no pass through or corridor around these areas closes vast areas of the CHNSRA to the American public. All other shore birds should be allocated no more than 30m for nesting and 30m for unfledged chicks with pass through corridors as there is no legal requirement to provide excessive buffers. In addition, the NPS fails to recognize the role played by the spoil islands behind Bodie Island, Hatteras Island, Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge and Ocracoke Island in the breeding of shore birds. These areas are typically with a few hundred yards of the CHNSRA and harbor large populations of shore birds. If the NPS truly wants to help the population of piping plovers they should investigate the usage of large cages placed around the nests to keep predators out of the nests. These are used in the Northeast where the major piping plover nesting takes place. The NPS and the USFWS seem content to kill hundreds of other wildlife to try to protect piping plovers but refuse to implement simpler techniques improve shore bird breeding success while improving access as well.

Option F describes measures required to "improve turtle breeding success". Many of the restrictions described in option F have little basis in peer reviewed science. For example, there is no evidence that night driving of ORVs has any impact on turtle nesting or hatchling survival. There have been no female turtles killed by ORVs. To protect turtle nests and improve hatchling success, CCA NC recommends relocation of turtle nests when they are laid in areas exposed to weather events. Using the fences used on the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge that are keyhole shaped are more effective for turtle hatchlings and would allow continued use of ORVs at night.

The surf zone of CHNSRA has been used for a hundred years for the purposes of swimming, sunbathing, fishing, birding and shelling. ORV usage is critical to the pursuit of these activities as much of the surf zone would be inaccessible without ORVs. The NPS, throughout the DEIS, seeks only to restrict ORV usage without proposing ways to improve access for ORVs and providing expanded habitat for those species which are threatened or endangered. It seems the NPS has forgotten the CHNSRA was established as a recreation area. Pea Island National Wildlife Sanctuary is for wildlife, yet under the de facto rules in place from 1978, there has been little difference in the successful breeding of piping plovers or endangered sea turtles. CCA NC urges you to revert to those rules put in place in 1978 to provide maximum access for ORVs and the American citizens.

Respectfully submitted,
Stephen Ammons Executive Director CCA NC

Correspondence ID: 12231 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:32:53
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. Please, we must preserve the few wild places left in our country.

Correspondence ID: 12232 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Botkin, gerald w
Received: May,10,2010 06:38:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I HAVE OWNED PROPERTY IN AVON , NC SINCE 1972 AT 39172 AVON, NC. OVER THE YEARS I HAVE NOT SEEN ANY TYPE OF PROBLEM WITH THE WILD LIFE ON THE BEACH. AND WHAT I HAVE SEEN IS THAT THE BIRD ARE MORE CONCERNED BY PEOPLE & PETS WALKING RIGHT NEXT TO THEIR NEST THAN VEHICLES DRIVING BY. THE 1000 YARD DISTANCE IS MUCH TO RESTRICTIVE. THE MARKED AREA BY THE PARK SERVICE IN THE PAST SEEMED TO BE A REASONABLE APPROACH TO PROTECING THE BIRD AND TURTLE NEST . I AM NOW 74 YEAR OLD AND HAVE PROBLEMS WALKIN USE OF THE VEHICLES HAS ENABLE MYSELF ANY MANY OTHERS TO CONTINUED TO USE THE RECREATIONAL AREAS.I HAVE NOT SEEN ANY DECLINE OF THE SHORE BIRD ON THE BEACH OF THE IN THE LAST 40 YEARS.

Correspondence ID: 12233 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Herr, Kathleen
Received: May,10,2010 06:42:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a devoted yearly visitor to Cape Hatteras, I respectfully ask that ORV use be limited. I am an enthusiastic beach fisherman who does not mind parking my car in designated lots, and actually WALKING over the dunes at the designated spots to enjoy the quiet, beautiful beaches, in the hopes of catching a fish or two for dinner.
This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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 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!
Respectfully, Kathleen D. Herr

Correspondence ID: 12234 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Fursich, Rob
Received: May,10,2010 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,
Rob Fursich

Correspondence ID: 12235 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Williamson Jr., Dennis H
Received: May,10,2010 06:43:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I will not be using the 35,000 characters available for commenting on this issue. However, what I will say is for the past two decades my family has been enjoying fellowship with one another a few weeks out of the year on the outer bank beaches of North Carolina. To that fact, we also are among those that enjoy venturing onto the beaches with our ORVs. Almost everyday we are on the outer banks we find ourselves piling as many of us in a few vehicles with our beach necessities and head out on Beach access 34. We drive out, find a nice place to park the vehicles and spend all day fellowshipping with one another along what we consider the most beautiful shoreline in the world. If the ability to enjoy the outer banks in this way was hampered or taken away, it just will not be the same. We understand that we want to take care of the beaches and all the wildlife and environment encompassed in that but that can be done without taking away what we consider the best parts about what makes this place great. We do our best to care for the area that we venture out on everyday while in the outer banks and are sure to watch out for any type of wild life that may be present at the time. Please allow for open access to the beaches that we love so dear. Thank You!

Correspondence ID: 12236 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wright, Samuel J
Received: May,10,2010 06:44:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I cannot imagine not being able to fish from the shore on Ocracoke Island. I cannot go out on boats due to seasickness, thus surf fishing is my joy. The continued unreasonable closures deny me and others from the experiences of fishing and enjoying the beauty of surf. In addition, the commerce, livelihood, and way of life of families are at stake. These are people, not numbers! My comments are brief, but sincere and strong. Keep the beaches open for all people.
Samuel Wright

Correspondence ID: 12237 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:49:18
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: 12238 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:50:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not allow an amendment that will increase beach vehicle traffic. For obvious reasons, I oppose this action: Wildlife could only be negatively affected by increased vehicle traffic on the beach.
Please keep in mind those that we are so fortunate to share this planet with. DO NOT allow for increased beach vehicle traffic.
Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12239 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:50:19
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: 12240 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:50:19
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: 12241 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:50:19
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: 12242 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 06:50:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I basically agree with the Dare County DEIS Position Statement. I do think that both sides of this issue need to strike a more middle point. For those who want unlimited access- those days are over. Things change, and resources need to be protected; however, the measures proposed to protect those resources appear to me to be just as extreme as those championed by those who want complete and open access. Two questions are brought to mind after I read the Dare County Statement. The first question is (and this addresses the point in the Position Statement about Management buffers), who are the people who are counting/observing the various species? More importantly, how many of these counters/observers are there? There is a lot of territory to cover on Hatteras Island which leads me to believe that there must be some extrapolation as to the (potential) numbers of endangered species. In a situation that has the potential to cripple an economy, where the effects will be felt in Raleigh, I think that there has to be a bipartisan group that thoughtfully and realistically observes and then sets standards to ensure that the rights of both sides of the issue are protected without going to extremes. The second question is (and this addresses the point in the Position Statement about Turtle Management), why treat Hatteras Island differently than other areas of the east coast with larger turtle populations? Finally, Hatteras Island was originally set aside as a recreational area for the American public. I don't think we can lose sight of that. I do think that this island can still be used by the American public while protecting our resources if a rational middle point(s) can be established.

Correspondence ID: 12243 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lewis, Jack
Received: May,10,2010 06:58:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My wife and I have first visited Hatteras Island in 1968 and have been in love with the area ever since. We spent our honeymoon there, and feasted on fish caught at Cape Point in celebration of our marriage. We have been visiting at every opportunity ever since and currently keep a camper there year round. The beach closures have had a serious negative impact on our use and enjoyment of the area. This is an area that we have supported through the taxes we have paid and we feel we are entitled to free access as has been the heritage of the area since the park was established by congress as a RECREATIONAL area.

The closures are irresponsible and will make future enjoyment and use of the area seriously degraded. We had always hoped to eventually share with our grandchildren (and thus future generations) the wonderful place Hatteras Island had always been but if the DEIS is finalized as is, the Islands will never be as accessible or enjoyable as they had been since before the NPS was formed.

I strongly urge the NPS to carefully consider the Coalition for Beach Access Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area ORV Access Environmental Impact Position Statement. The positions stated in that document and its attachments represent a common sense, reasonable approach to address two of the most significant responsibilities the National Park Service must fulfill within the ORV Management Plan.

These responsibilities are: 1) The protection of resources without impairment to or from the visiting public and 2) the protection of Traditional, Cultural, Recreational and Commercial values for the visiting public with limited disruption.

The goals written by Congress in the enabling legislation that created the Recreational Area recognized these responsibilities. The Coalition is confident ORV access to the beaches has not historically adversely affected the Recreational Area environment. The Coalition is equally confident that, in the future, the ORV management plan guidelines it endorses will not negatively impact the environmental qualities that were responsible for the creation of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area and its continued popularity.

Thanks, Jack Lewis

Correspondence ID: 12244 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Austin, William E
Received: May,10,2010 06:58:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

The Coastal Conservation Association North Carolina wishes to comment on the recently released Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the ORV Management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area issued by the National Park Service. The objective of CCA is to conserve, promote and enhance the present and future availability of these coastal resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the general public. As such the thousands of members and volunteers of CCA NC and their nearly three quarters of a million associated recreational anglers are very disappointed in the six options for ORV management on CHNSRA. First of all the document itself is very difficult to follow in its 800+ pages. The tragedy is that none of the six options reflect the wishes of the vast majority of the CHNSRA visiting public and CCA NC. While there are preferred environmental and NPS options, there is no pro-access preferred option. The CHNSRA was established specifically for the American public to enjoy the seashore. To propose no option which provides a maximum access option certainly violates the spirit and perhaps the letter of the laws establishing this national park. Without serving the visiting public, The NPS has failed in its responsibility to our citizens. All the options presented in the DEIS seek to restrict public access well beyond any reasonable or legal requirement.

It is clear that significant facts have been ignored in the preparation of this DEIS. The success of turtle nesting and piping plover nesting and fledging is virtually unchanged since the de facto ORV plan was implemented in 1978. The primary causes of failed nesting and fledging are overwhelmingly predation and weather events which have occurred for hundreds of years. ORV caused mortality is a fraction of 1%. The USFWS and NPS personnel have caused more plover mortality. Yet, the NPS chooses to attack those users who are very sensitive to the wildlife in the CHNSRA.

The DEIS options all include restrictions which, when implemented as they have been under the consent decree, will unnecessarily close miles and miles of beach access both from the ocean and sound side. The many options describe no action which can circumvent a nesting closure in order to access an open area of the beach. Thus, while a stretch of waterfront may be "open" it is inaccessible. This represents nothing more than verbal trickery and masks the true available waterfront.

The specifics of option F, the NPS preferred option, require at least some comment as commenting on all options would extend beyond the available space and time constraints. Overall, the DEIS suggests there would be 52 of 68 miles of the waterfront "open" to ORV access but it is not clear that this includes any calculation of sound side access for ORVs or pedestrians. CCA NC strongly believes the "buffer" or closure areas suggested for piping plovers in various stages of nesting and fledging are beyond excessive. For nesting piping plovers 50 meters is more than adequate and as is 200 meters for unfledged chicks. To suggest that unfledged chicks of a bird that is less than 1 foot tall requires over a mile of seashore is ludicrous! All this with no pass through or corridor around these areas closes vast areas of the CHNSRA to the American public. All other shore birds should be allocated no more than 30m for nesting and 30m for unfledged chicks with pass through corridors as there is no legal requirement to provide excessive buffers. In addition, the NPS fails to recognize the role played by the spoil islands behind Bodie Island, Hatteras Island, Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge and Ocracoke Island in the breeding of shore birds. These areas are typically with a few hundred yards of the CHNSRA and harbor large populations of shore birds. If the NPS truly wants to help the population of piping plovers they should investigate the usage of large cages placed around the nests to keep predators out of the nests. These are used in the Northeast where the major piping plover nesting takes place. The NPS and the USFWS seem content to kill hundreds of other wildlife to try to protect piping plovers but refuse to implement simpler techniques improve shore bird breeding success while improving access as well.

Option F describes measures required to "improve turtle breeding success". Many of the restrictions described in option F have little basis in peer reviewed science. For example, there is no evidence that night driving of ORVs has any impact on turtle nesting or hatchling survival. There have been no female turtles killed by ORVs. To protect turtle nests and improve hatchling success, CCA NC recommends relocation of turtle nests when they are laid in areas exposed to weather events. Using the fences used on the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge that are keyhole shaped are more effective for turtle hatchlings and would allow continued use of ORVs at night.

The surf zone of CHNSRA has been used for a hundred years for the purposes of swimming, sunbathing, fishing, birding and shelling. ORV usage is critical to the pursuit of these activities as much of the surf zone would be inaccessible without ORVs. The NPS, throughout the DEIS, seeks only to restrict ORV usage without proposing ways to improve access for ORVs and providing expanded habitat for those species which are threatened or endangered. It seems the NPS has forgotten the CHNSRA was established as a recreation area. Pea Island National Wildlife Sanctuary is for wildlife, yet under the de facto rules in place from 1978, there has been little difference in the successful breeding of piping plovers or endangered sea turtles. CCA NC urges you to revert to those rules put in place in 1978 to provide maximum access for ORVs and the American citizens.

Correspondence ID: 12245 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Martof, Andrew B
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

I am the Vice president of the Durant Station Condominium Association, a 33-unit condominium project located on nearly 2 acres of ocean-front land in Hatteras Village, NC. Our Association consists of families who own these properties for personal recreational use, as well as to generate rental income. After rebuilding the project in its entirety following total destruction by Hurricane Isabel in 2003, we currently have sizable financial and emotional investments in this area of the Outer Banks. We are obviously directly affected by any form of restriction on the use of recreational assets of the area, with the National Seashore Beaches being the primary attraction! The beaches, along with their recreational opportunities, are the primary reason people visit the Outer Banks! Although we value birds and animals and enjoy viewing them, we believe that society's desire to protect and preserve selected species of birds and other wildlife must be "balanced" against legitimate human access to the unique recreational opportunities offered by National Seashore Beaches on the Outer Banks. We therefore disagree with any beach management approach, which would prevent human access to and recreational use of these beaches!! We believe that there are always creative ways available to manage human activities while protecting threatened and endangered species.

We strongly disagree with the "NPS Preferred Alternative F" because we consider it to be unnecessarily restrictive of human recreational access. It does not demonstrate why such a severe level of restricted access is needed or desirable. There is no proven scientific basis that any shorebird requires a 1,000 meter or larger buffer zone to prevent harm from human presence. Any buffer requirement should start as small as practicable, such as 10-20 meters. A buffer size should only be increased with the support of valid video-documented evidence that the existing buffer size is insufficient to prevent physical harm to the species. "Harm" should not include occasional "defensive posturing" or other normal and routine actions, including flight. Pedestrian foot traffic such as anglers, surfers, beachcombers, runners, etc., which are commonly seen on beaches, should always be allowed to occur on beaches. Any proposed buffer zones for pedestrians should be substantially smaller than corresponding buffer zones that pertain to vehicles. No

protection scheme should include a ban on foot traffic/pedestrian use! There is no evidence that shorebirds or other species are harmed in any way by pedestrians when given a small buffer zone to protect nesting activity. Logic would indicate that a bird would typically not choose to nest in an area or amidst any level of activity, which it found to be uncomfortable or disruptive to its reproductive routine. Vehicular access should also be preserved to the unique geography at the point and inlets to insure all visitors have an opportunity to appreciate and enjoy their beauty and uniqueness.

We agree with and support the positions established by the Coalition for Beach Access (see <http://www.obpa-nc.org/position/statement.pdf> and <http://www.obpa-nc.org/position/assessment.pdf>).

We agree with and support the positions established by Dare County, NC (see <http://www.hatterasislandtimes.com/PDFs/DCDEIS.pdf>).

We are looking to the NPS to establish and preserve a reasonable balance between the needs of wild life to reproduce and propagate their species and the rights of the public to access and enjoy its National Treasures, e.g., the Outer Banks National Seashore Beaches. The majority of residents and visitors do not seek out the relatively remote southern Hatteras Island areas simply to observe birds or turtles, although many of us enjoy both. Rather, the inherent enjoyment offered by accessing the beach in a variety of ways, including fishing, comprise arguably the primary attraction.

It can be all too easy to lose track of the "big picture" when working through highly complex and contentious resource allocation issues. Please do not lose sight of the fact that the humans, e.g., U.S. Citizens, are entitled to receive priority consideration in the non-destructive use and enjoyment of the Outer Banks' unique recreational resources.

The protocols put into place by the NPS to manage Outer Banks beaches should be an example of smart co-existence and balanced management practices, not extremist bans and excessive management practices driven by fear of punitive law suits. The current process appears to be driven, in part, by "single-issue groups", who would seek to restrict the rights and recreational opportunities of the majority solely to further their well intended, yet extreme and unnecessarily restrictive views of appropriate conservation measures.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please weigh our views carefully in finalizing any regulatory regimes, which would restrict our access to land, which we as U.S. Citizens own in common.

Andrew Martof Vice President Durant Station Condominium Association, Inc

Correspondence ID: 12246 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:03:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am in favor of LIMITING

Correspondence ID: 12247 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:06:27
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. I fully support the stance of the National Parks Conservation Association on this matter as described below. *** TODAY, when natural habitats are so scarce and vulnerable, we must err on the side of preservation over use.***
 "All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals."
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12248 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 07:07:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Don't let vehicles on the beach.

Correspondence ID: 12249 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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.
 Ecosystems are extremely delicate and with the Gulf Oil Spill's unknown effect on wildlife it should be obvious we need to protect our pristine and precious habitats for generations to enjoy. ORV have no place in our primitive wilderness or parks. ORV are offensive not only to human enjoyment of

nature they are offensive to the delicate ecosystems they destroy.

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

Correspondence ID:	12250	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 07:12:08						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I am in favor of LIMITING rather than expanding vehicle use in our National parks and seashores. Vehicles destroy habitat and ecosystems, contribute to the causes of global warming and our nations obesity epidemic, and are disruptive to those who are participating in less intrusive recreational activities.						
Correspondence ID:	12251	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I am a resident of Charlottesville, VA and also own a home in Ocracoke, NC. My family and I enjoy the recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. There should be reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach but not as restricted as the NPS's preferred alternative F. I don't believe this alternative has adequately addressed the economic impact on the area. Neither does it use very good science when protecting birds that are not on the endangered species list. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least review and negotiate on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.						
Correspondence ID:	12252	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 07:14:41						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please think carefully about what you are doing. If you allow ATV's access to this beautiful eco-important area it will ruin it for the wildlife that survive there. Atv's destroy the land and plants they cross. Their noise pollution harms nature lovers enjoyment of the natural sounds of the area. The air pollution from the ATV engines is a harm to the environment. Please keep this great natural area free from ATV harmful effects .						
Correspondence ID:	12253	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 07:16:32						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I am not in favor and oppose all of the alternatives A-F for the ORV management plan for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area on the DEIS. None of these alternatives truly balance the need for balancing the recreational use and the wildlife for CHNSRA. I fully support and agree with the alternative as presented by the Coalition for Beach Access. Coalition for Beach Access DEIS Assessment dated 4/13/2010. One specific area that I do not agree on in alternative F that is favor by NPS is the buffers used. The buffers used are excessive and not based on any peer reviewed science not are they based on any already successful and much less restive methods used by other NPS management at locations where the Piping Plover is much more prevalent. I strongly disagree with shorebirds that are included in Alt F that are not listed under the Endangered Species Act. NPS has not justification for including these species and in fact is not even supported by North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission. A second area that I do not agree with in alternative F is the night time restrictions and overall management of Turtles on CHNSRA. I do support Sea Turtle Management ? A Common Sense Approach for the Cape Hatteras Seashore Recreational Area Authors: Larry Hardham Bob Davis May 05, 2010. This document represents exactly how turtles should be managed on CHNSRA. One specific example is that Alt F support night time closures of Beaches for extended periods of time. There is no peer reviewed science that supports this restriction including no proven benefits. Moving nests from areas where over washes destroy turtles nest every year will far out weigh current management practices and results. Lastly, I do not agree with NPS practices to trap and kill thousand of other native animals to protect any species on CHNSRA.						
Correspondence ID:	12254	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	Barnett, Charlie H						
Received:	May,10,2010 07:16:33						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I am a lifelong resident of Hatteras Island (Hatteras Village) and during my 46 years I have witnessed many changes, but the change that is in the wind now is one of grave concern. How can a few lawyers dictate what the vast majority of the people can do in a national seashore recreational area that was created under the premiss that all would always have access to? I have had the luxury of being raised in this wonderful and diverse place but it worries me that the closurer of our beach access will not allow me to afford my 10 year old daughter the same advantages of growing up here. We have taught her that the wildlife is just doing what is natural and the mentality that these creatures do not belong here is wrong. We have coexisted for generation after generation, and I believe have gotten along just fine. A small bird that is not native to this area does not need the equivalent of a small city block to roam. I remember as a child that there were a lot of pheasant on the island and the next thing you know they are all gone. Surely the lawyers won't try to pin this on ORV or pedestrian access. No, it was the NPS that got rid of a non native species. It seems stange to me that this handful of people can use the failure of implementing an orv management plan to close cripple the economy of an entire area. I firmly believe if Hatteras inlet was not closed on 05/01/2010 that a life might possibly have been spared as someone would have seen the accident and been able to report it much sooner than it was discovered. In closing, I would ask you to do the right thing and allow what was promised to my ancestors when this park was opened. Thank you Charlie H. Barnett						
Correspondence ID:	12255	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 07:16:43						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I have been to Cape Hatteras and was appalled to see the damage done to beaches by ORV's. The callous disregard for shorebird nesting and sea turtles habitat cannot go on. The species dependent upon our coastal areas deserve our top priority, not the visitors who seek to abuse the resource for their own selfish reasons. Improve education on why protecting habitat is so critical for survival of these species; improve pedestrian access so that people have more opportunities to observe and witness the shore without the disturbance of motorized vehicles. Curtail access to ORV's to a smaller segment of the area and eliminate access in all areas where birds and turtles are nesting. Science and law, not political pressure should guide the NPS in making decisions about these essential resources. Pea Island is not enough habitat!						
Correspondence ID:	12256	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:17:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is unnecessary. How many things are humans going to need to invade? enough is enough.
Off roading is NOT a necessity.
Sury

Correspondence ID: 12257 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 07:17:48
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: 12258 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 07:18:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Humans do not have the right to destroy the environment in the name of fun.

Correspondence ID: 12259 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:19:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12260 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:19:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

My wife and I have been a property owners in Salvo since the early 70's. I am also an avid bird watcher and very interested in the welfare and conservation of all wildlife.

I feel compromise and good judgment are the keys to providing both protection of wildlife and recreational opportunities for visitors and natives. There should be no reason why both the wildlife and visitors can coexist, provided that are critical times, wildlife is not disturbed or threatened.

I personally do not see the need for ORVs to have free reign to joy ride anywhere on the beach. Again, we need compromise.

Regards, -Joe and Sally Byrnes

Correspondence ID: 12261 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
1 -- Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. 2 -- Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. 3 -- Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met.
I look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12262 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:19:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12263 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:19:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12264 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:19:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12265 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:20:21
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: 12266 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:20:21
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: 12267 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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, both of which are important to me.
Limiting the use of Off Road Vehicles on the beach would enhance the ability of pedestrians and swimmers and sunbathers to enjoy these beaches. Many is the time I have come out of the water to find my beach blanket with all my clothes had been run over by some truck. If you limit the use of off road vehicles say for example to the immediate area of a beach access ramp rather than permitting them to drive up and down the beach, the fisherman would still be able to get their gear to the water's edge without causing issues to other beachgoers and wildlife.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife, and off road vehicle should be confined to the area in the immediate vicinity of the beach access ramps. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional

numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12268 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:20:32

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: 12269 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:20:32

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: 12270 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:20:38

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: 12271 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:20:38
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: 12272 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:21:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray, as an avid National Park visitor, I am alarmed by your plan to allow ORV use in Cape Hatteras National Seashore. ORV use is not consistent with the mission of the park, it will destroy natural resources, and it will make the park not very enjoyable for any other kind of user. Please reconsider this devastating proposal. Sincerely, Barbara Diederichs.

Correspondence ID: 12273 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:25:17
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: 12274 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Coughlin, Peter
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
I urge you to place the interests of the animal and plant life of Cape Hatteras National Seashore over those of human use, and place low-impact human access and use (such as access by foot) over that of high-impact human activity such as off road vehicle use. Frankly, I would prefer that all recreation motorized vehicle access be ended.
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:	12275	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Cooper, Ken D				
Received:	May,10,2010 07:27:29				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	First, I want to state that I adamantly oppose the severe ORV restrictions to out Outer banks. My grandfather shared it with my father, my father shared it with me, and I'm now sharing it with my children. I spend at least 4 weeks a year out there, fishing up and down the beach, and always participate in cleaning up the refuse that washes ashore. I'm a bird lover in addition to a fisherman, and respect their areas, but feel the bird scenario has gotten out of control and led to the conversion of what's intended to be a recreational area, into an over controlled government nuisance. Last week, I received a letter from DOW, asking me to write you and complain about ORV's and that they endanger turtles and birds. They claimed they were using a "science based" study. This request went to people across America, most whom have never been to the Outer Banks. I'm sure some will take the time to do it. But in reality, there's NO scientific study that supports their claims, and there's no bona fide economic impact study either. I just returned from the OBX, along with 18 of my friends, where we cut our trip short because of the very limited access to surf fishing. This is the same group of guys that have been fishing together since 1973 and converge from Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, South Carolina, New Jersey, and of course North Carolina. i can tell you that we are disgusted with the actions of the NPS, and the attempts by Audubon, DOW, and SELC to take away our rights to enjoy our lands, in the name of fake science.				
Correspondence ID:	12276	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	private				
Received:	May,10,2010 07:28:34				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	What is wrong with people in this country? We have witnessed the destruction of so much of our precious land and animals. Why would we even consider allowing off road vehicles on one of our national seashores? When will we say enough is enough and stop allowing the abuse to our nation's treasures? We have a responsibility to protect not only our seashores, but all the animals that this will affect. Please vote against this and keep the Cape Hatteras National Seashore protected from off-road vehicles.				
Correspondence ID:	12277	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Latham, Judith C				
Received:	May,10,2010 07:29:48				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	In light of new data in the recently published Turtle Recovery Study at CHNS by Hardham/Davis, I strongly urge total scrapping of the DEIS's turtle management plan and facilitation of the recommendations made in the Hardham/Davis study. In addition, I would like to know what provisions the DEIS plan has made for when the piping plover population has recovered (only 110 nesting pairs away) and is removed from the threatened species list.				
Correspondence ID:	12278	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Murray, Catherine G				
Received:	May,10,2010 07:30:25				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	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.				
Correspondence ID:	12279	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	N/A, N/A				
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. I ask that any plan that is approved will do the following: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. Many users like myself do not use the beach when ORVs are present. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. Additionally, it should be noted that people like me stay away due to the ORV use - so any claim that non-motorized use "harms" the economics of the area is simply irrational. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Any other alternative does not address the significant findings that ORV use harms wildlife, and that the wildlife has been doing much better with more restrictions in place. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.				
Correspondence ID:	12280	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Garbrick, Kathe				
Received:	May,10,2010 07:30:58				
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: 12281 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:31:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off roading destroys the natural beauty of the location that it is allowed in. It also keeps animals away. The reason I know this is there some off roading in my area. Please keep in mind that off roading does destroy the land it is on. If you have a beautiful area with wildlife that needs to be preserved off roading is not the answer. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12282 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 07:31:13
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: 12283 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cox, Brian
Received: May,10,2010 07:32:55
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.
Sincerely, Brian Cox

Correspondence ID: 12284 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wilder, jenny
Received: May,10,2010 07:38:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think we need to wake up and start to take notice of what we are doing to our home with motor vehicles. Motor vehicles do not belong on the beach any more than raw sewage and trash. It is a place where birds feed, breed and turtles lay their eggs. the ocean is an important source of our food and should be kept clean and healthy. One way to help do that is to keep the shores healthy for wildlife. The beach is a place people can go for serenity, exercise and renewal without excessively degrading the habitat. Vehicles do not belong on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Sincerely,
Jenny Wilder

Correspondence ID: 12285 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gosselin, Christopher G
Received: May,10,2010 07:40:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Many of our irreplaceable natural areas in North America are being threatened by irresponsible O.R.V. use. I urge you to put the needs of vulnerable wildlife species first in the planning and management of the splendid Cape Hatteras N.S., and the needs of the full spectrum of human visitors second. Unfortunately, irresponsible O.R.V. users create annoyance for other visitors and may even at times jeopardise their safety as they walk about the site. It

is time to prohibit O.R.V. use altogether, or at the very least to restrict it to areas where it does not threaten wildlife, degrade their habitat, and greatly detract from the enjoyment of many other classes of human visitors.

Correspondence ID: 12286 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Ashby, Stephen
Received: May,10,2010 07:41:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Don't ruin our dunes. Leave the Outer Banks as pristine as is still possible.

Correspondence ID: 12287 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 07:41:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12288 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:42:41
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,
Stephen Ashby

Correspondence ID: 12289 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 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,
Laura Bersen

Correspondence ID: 12290 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:43:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Superintendent Murray,
as a former Park Service employee, I am concerned about the possibility of the peace and tranquility of Cape Hatteras Nat.Seashore being destroyed by a potential onslaught of off-road vehicle usage.
When Congress opened this great area, it was with the understanding that PRIMARY emphasis would be towards at least most of the National Seashore being preserved as a PERMANENT, primitive wilderness area. I just don't see HOW off-road vehicles can NOT have a severely damaging affect on not only the wildlife, but also on the persons who go to Cape Hatteras for a renewed feeling of peace of mind and TOTAL tranquility. Off-Road users have tremendous access to thousands of square miles of National Forest and B.L.M. land, without invading even more of the National Park land than what they already have.
Thanks and Sincerely,
Steve Chelewski

Correspondence ID: 12291 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:44:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear National Park Service,
It is important to keep National Treasures like the Cape as they are for future generations to see as those before us have viewed them and as we have had the privilege to enjoy them. Keep development under control: let it happen elsewhere rather than spoil the Cape and our heritage for all time by development.

Correspondence ID: 12292 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Nugent, Patrick
Received: May,10,2010 07:45:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly disagree with the DEIS plan as it does not adequately take into account the cultural component of resource management that ORV access beaches has been a significant constant multi-generational use.
The NPS plan fails to appropriately address the traditional cultural value of surf zone access. The NPS failure stands in direct violation of its legal responsibility under Section 106 of the NEPA and the NEPA framework as a whole.
In over 40 years of visiting the cape, my father taught me to fish at the Cape Point and I have taught my own children there as well. Our extended families and the vast majority of visitors respect and adore the natural habitat and wildlife present on the Cape. My own family and I have personally spent many hours lifting turtles over 2 foot iron dredging pipes in the 1970's to allow them to reach the ocean. The proposed plan does not include sufficient "proactive management" of these resources, said interventions which would provide a more effective alternative to achieve the goals of preservation then the extreme sequestering of these habitats.
The extraordinarily large and arbitrary buffer zones which are not based on scientifically validated criteria, and the lack of consideration of sound alternatives ensure the only outcome of the management is extreme restrictions and de facto closure to ORV access.
Alternatives used successfully elsewhere, such as ORV corridors combined with proactive management measures will produce better preservation results without devastating the local shore economies and will allow the continued historically and culturally significant use; essential to maintaining the cultural fabric and historical identity of the southern Cape's shore communities.
Again, The NPS plan therefore does appropriately consider the traditional cultural value of these resources. The NPS failure stands in direct violation of its legal responsibility under Section 106 of the NEPA and the NEPA framework as a whole.

Correspondence ID: 12293 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lifsey, Barbara
Received: May,10,2010 07:47:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly disagree with Alternative F of the DEIS. I believe in the protection for shorebirds and sea turtles but the buffers for the birds in alternative F are too extensive and should be scaled back to a more reasonable level and access corridors should be allowed in all cases so that the public can access the open beach areas down the beach line.
I agree with the Dare County Board of Commissioners position on the DEIS

Correspondence ID: 12294 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a supporter of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
Regards,
Michael Bartell
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of

the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12295 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:49:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
I would love for my children to be able to see them some day!
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12296 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:49:19
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: 12297 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:49:19
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: 12298 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:49:19
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: 12299 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Finally, motor vehicles do not belong on any beach, particularly not a federally protected beach.

Correspondence ID: 12300 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:49:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a concerned citizen and user of NPS lands, I object to the use of ORVs on the beaches of Cape Hatteras. My family and I come to NPS areas to escape the noise and pressures of everyday life. ORVs have no place in the NPS system. They cause noise and air pollution and will disturb, and damage, sensitive coastal systems and wildlife. Please turn away this threat to our parks.

Correspondence ID: 12301 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:49:25
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: 12302 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:50:23
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: 12303 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:50:23
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: 12304 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 07:50:23
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:	12305	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 07:50:41						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12306	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 07:51:04						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>PLEASE KEEP VEHICLES OFF OUR NATIONAL SEASHORE! KEEP IT FROM BEING RUINED BY THESE VEHICLES! LET'S KEEP OUR CAPE HATTERAS SEASHORE LOOKING NIVR AND ANIMALS SAFE!</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12307	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Russell, Susan						
Received:	May,10,2010 07:53:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I am commenting on the DEIS plan, specifically Option F. I feel the 1,000 meter setback around plover nests is unnecessarily harsh and based on no known scientific fact. In addition, the 200 meter setback for birds not on any endangered list is arbitrary and unnecessary. Further, closing the southern end of Hatteras Island and the northern end of Ocracoke where there are no plover nests, is baffling at best. I and my family and dogs have enjoyed Hatteras Island for 40 years. We love the fact that much of it is undeveloped and that nature abounds. Unfortunately the efforts of some well meaning people to "protect" a certain species of bird have overreached that which is needed to protect the birds and will have a huge impact on our ability to continue to enjoy this recreation area. Thank you for you time. Susan Russell</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12308	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,10,2010 07:53:46						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please don't allow off-road vehicles on Cape Hatteras National Seashore						
Correspondence ID:	12309	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 07:57:04						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I am writing to voice my opinion as to which alternative management plan should be used for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan. As an undergraduate at the University of Missouri studying environmental science, protecting the vital and unique characteristics of the environment are of utmost importance to me. However, I am not insensitive to recreational uses of the environment, such as off-road vehicles, and the potential economic benefits that these uses could bring to the area. For both of these reasons, seasonal management of the off-road vehicles (ORV), or alternative C, seems to be the best middle ground that could be reached.</p> <p>Seasonal management of ORV usage would allow for protected wildlife and habitat to have an additional safeguard against interference from visitors during the critical times of the breeding and hatchling/fledgling stages. These stages are critical for the continuation and development of these species, and as such should be a priority in the management plan of these areas. With these species being protected, Cape Hatteras is more diverse in its wildlife and plant life. This makes the habitat more stable and thus more likely to be withstand environmental changes that may affect the area. These species also offer unique opportunities for visitors to engage, and continue to engage, with endangered species that may not be encountered in many other public locations.</p> <p>The seasonal management plan's careful consideration of wetlands offers the least impact out of all the alternatives. For the local wetlands, impacts are kept to a negligible level in both the short and long-term outlook. This is a huge advantage for the area, since wetlands are known to be one of the habitats with the highest biodiversity, along with rain forests and coral reefs. This high biodiversity will stabilize the environment and offer many wildlife-based sight-seeing opportunities to visitors. Wetlands will also help prevent shoreline erosion, a large problem in areas that have been drained or altered from their natural wetland state. A small note: although signage is not guaranteed to prevent people from impacting an area by driving off the specified ORV routes, it is far superior to no public statement acting as a deterrent.</p> <p>Floodplains are also a vital water resource that should be well-considered in a management plan. In the seasonal management plan, floodplains would have a minor impact in the long-term due to construction of parking lots. This is advantageous since of all developments to be made, parking lots will not be severely affected by flood waters. It is suggested, however, that no other developments such as buildings be made in this area. Also, using materials that reduce water runoff will minimize the impact of having paved surfaces in this area.</p> <p>The seasonal management alternative also allows for predictability for ORV users. It is important for visitors to have some predictability so that their</p>						

trip can be planned accordingly. By offering some ORV trails that are open year round, there are always opportunities to go off-roading. However, with seasonally open trails, it gives visitors the chance to experience new sites. This will entice visitors to continue to come back, offering both economic incentives and protection for the wildlife.

Also, with the seasonal management plan offering more restraints than the current plan, less of the area is likely to be impacted by ORVs. With less impact made from people and ORVs, the habitat and wildlife is more likely to thrive and remain healthy. This would allow for people for generations to continue to visit a unique and intricate environment without degrading the land.

Overall, out of all the alternatives for a management plan for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Plan, seasonal management combines the best of environmental protection and recreational use of the area. It is for that reason that I urge you to consider this plan over others, as it offers the most overall benefits.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Caroline Tanner

Correspondence ID: 12310 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 07:58:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Vehicles do not belong on the beach!

Correspondence ID: 12311 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Keel, Thomas M
Received: May,10,2010 07:58:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep our National Parks about preservation for future generations while providing for recreation today. ORVs do not fit into that picture regardless of the lobbying done by that industry.

Correspondence ID: 12312 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Weigel, Molly
Received: May,10,2010 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 have long had a respect for Cape Hatteras' wild beaches and my parents spent their honeymoon there in the 1950s precisely because of this wildness. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." As a frequent visitor to New Jersey beaches, including Island Beach State Park, I have seen the impact of ORVs on our few remaining wild beaches.
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12313 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:04:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a resident of North Carolina and a visitor to the Outer Banks from my home in the mountains it is important to me to protect our resources as well as the rights of North Carolinians local to the area as I hope all would respect my rights in Western North Carolina. After reading the Environmental Impact Statement I would support Alternative D: Increased Predictability and Simplified Management. Off road vehicle use has long lasting effects on environmental quality for plants and animals which outweighs the reduced ability to utilize the beaches and dunes as one wishes.

Correspondence ID: 12314 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: FINDERUP, LARS
Received: May,10,2010 08:05:57
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,
Lars M. Finderup

Correspondence ID: 12315 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:09:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not allow allow ORV on Cape Hatteras beaches. The wildlife will be destroyed by thoughtless and careless drivers. Cape Hatteras is a national treasure which must be protected.

Correspondence ID: 12316 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 08:12:53
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. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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! Please keep ORVs out of our parks. Sincerely,
Donna Damarodas

Correspondence ID: 12317 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 08:14:44
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: 12318 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Todd, Michael
Received: May,10,2010 08:17:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Don't let off-road vehicles ruin the beautiful Cape Hatteras landscape.

Correspondence ID: 12319 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:18:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to ORV use on beaches, these are fragile environments that should be closed to motorized travel and instead focus use on pedestrian travel along our beaches. Motorized use is of particular concern due to sea turtle nesting and shorebird nesting sensitive specie that need our protection. I urge you to oppose the use of ORV travel on our beaches.

Correspondence ID: 12320 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Luehrmann, Paul F
Received: May,10,2010 08:18:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I welcome the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's (NPS) Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
When I think about Cape Hatteras National Seashore: I think of waves, shorebirds, solitude and sea turtles. Overall, a natural experience at a protected seashore.
As someone who frequents many NPS locations across the United States, I feel the plan as currently proposed will disproportionately dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors.
I own and use an ORV. However, I have seen firsthand the abuses that unlimited ORV use can bring to deserts, seashores, forests and other places best left in a natural state.
Therefore, I strongly feel that this plan should be rejected and a new ORV management plan that places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.
I also think many Americans are missing an opportunity to experience some solitude in their daily lives. They discover this often in our National Parks.
Therefore, please help maintain a reasonable balance for all users of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Please keep my involved in this decision making process.
Thank you and best regards,
Paul Luehrmann

Correspondence ID: 12321 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:19:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12322 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:19:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12323 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Romer, Elke
Received: May,10,2010 08:19:24
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.

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,
Elke Romer

Correspondence ID: 12324 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:19:27
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: 12325 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. As a frequent visitor to New Jersey beaches, including Island Beach State Park, where vast stretches of natural beach are open for ORV use, I know how much ORVs can decrease the enjoyment of pedestrians and impact wildlife. I also visit Cape May beaches where such use is not allowed--the difference is staggering.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12326 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:20:26

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: 12327 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:20:26

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.

Sea Turtles and shore birds are taking enough of a beating from the horrific oil spill in the Gulf Coast. Lets give them all the help we can by making North Carolina's shores more friendly and safe for them and the people who love them.

Correspondence ID: 12328 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:20:31

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: 12329 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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 beachgoer, I've seen what happens when reckless and/or distracted drivers speed and make the pedestrian/wildlife experience not very fun. There are areas where folks can use their vehicles but the beach should be peaceful, quiet, and most of all, an undisturbed home for the wildlife that call it home. Allowing these vehicles this access is very short-sighted. If we make the place inhospitable, the reason people come to visit will die or leave, and then everyone loses.

Correspondence ID: 12330 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 08:20:32

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: 12331 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 08:20:32

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: 12332 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 08:20:32

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:	12333	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	McCallum, Elizabeth A				
Received:	May,10,2010 08:21:26				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I believe that the only motorized vehicles allowed on beaches are those for emergency use.As a beach lover, I have been very upset when I have seen vehicles tearing up sand dunes.				
Correspondence ID:	12334	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	nelson, lois e				
Received:	May,10,2010 08:24:26				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	There are fewer and fewer places in America where people can go for a bit of peace and quiet. The ocean shore has traditionally been one of these places. Please do not take that away from us to accommodate those few who equate the roar of unmuffled engines and the stink of burning gasoline with having a good time.				
Correspondence ID:	12335	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Yates, Harry				
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>My wife and I are VIPs in "our" national park system. In addition to working several months in Lassen, New River Gorge, (this year) Rocky Mountain NPs we have visited many of the national parks. We have proudly embraced the NPS slogan of "protect and preserve". Allowing ORVs in, around and on this pristine land will cause the degradation of the sea shore. Please protect it to the fullest level and consider the silent majority who I fully believe would want this national seashore fully protected from ORV destruction and noise.</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.</p> <p>This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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>Sincerely, Harry Yates 850-962-7852</p>				
Correspondence ID:	12336	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Weldon, Amy				
Received:	May,10,2010 08:26:59				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Please keep off-road vehicles off these beaches. This should be a no-brainer, frankly, considering how destructive of land and wildlife these machines are, and how we as Americans, with our skyrocketing rates of obesity and disconnection from nature, need to engage healthily and actively with the land by walking over it rather than riding motor vehicles on it. Thank you. Amy Weldon, Decorah, Iowa				
Correspondence ID:	12337	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Vo, Kassie				
Received:	May,10,2010 08:27:05				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I support alternative C. I do believe that appropriate steps need to be taken to preserve wildlife. However, alternative F takes such extreme actions with little consideration for the impact on the residents of the Outer Banks as well as visitors to the Cape Hatteras national seashore. I believe that alternative F will do more harm than good. Minimalist environmental management approaches have worked well throughout the United States' National Parks and I implore the NPS to not be blind to the ramifications that alternative F will have on the local economy.				
Correspondence ID:	12338	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Peppin, Marilyn				
Received:	May,10,2010 08:28:25				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I am totally agaisnst any authorization for off-run vehicles using the Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches. These beaches belong to the majority of people using them not to a minority of those ORV drivers and to the wildlife.				

Correspondence ID: 12339 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:30:17
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.

Off road vehicles do not belong anywhere on parklands.
Thank you, Susan Carroll

Correspondence ID: 12340 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 08:32:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please protect our beaches!

Correspondence ID: 12341 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:32:15
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: 12342 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Anthony, Paul
Received: May,10,2010 08:33:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We cannot mess up yet another pristine place....those off-road vehiclers have enough places already....no more of this kind of careless activity

Correspondence ID: 12343 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:36:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: supt.Murry I disagree with the alternatives of the NPS DEIS, and feel there has to be a better way. Please find a way to lighten the burden you are placing on the locals and visitors of the Outer banks.

Correspondence ID: 12344 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:36:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: supt.Murry I disagree with the alternatives of the NPS DEIS, and feel there has to be a better way. Please find a way to lighten the burden you are placing on the locals and visitors of the Outer banks.

Correspondence ID: 12345 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Peele, Skylr A
Received: May,10,2010 08:37:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I DISAGREE with what the environmentalist groups that are trying to shut down are beaches. the amount of land that they are trying to shut down for one nest is ridiculous. 771 acres for one nest is way to much. If this bill gets passed then the people on Hatteras Island will have to leave, there will be no more jobs to support the locals. this island lives off the tourist that come down to vist one of the best beaches on the east coast, and if the beach gets shut down, then tourist wont come down witch will end every thing on the island. SO ITS SIMPLE THE PEOPLE OR THE BIRDS!

Correspondence ID: 12346 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Austin, Maggie E
Received: May,10,2010 08:37:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with this bill that is trying to be passed throughout the National Park Service. The biggest factor that I disagree with is the area that they are trying to inclose. They are trying to take 771 acres from the NATIONAL PARK, passed by the Nixon Presidency, saying that in some areas of the states, there should be National Parks, for all people to visit and enjoy. During his presidency, Nixon tried to stress the factor of people having a place to enjoy. With the plan that the Government is trying to pass, it will not only endanger the people who live on Hatteras Island, but the tourist that make this Island what it was made out to be. The tourist industrilized factor of the Island is the main factor throught the life here. Without business here, everything here would go to ruin. Not only would the business be ruined, but also the environment. The economy here and the people who live here would suffer because the Beach is their home. Horses, dogs, and any other animal that needs exercise could not recive as much as they needed if the Beaches were closed. Due to having a horse on this Island, it would ruin my training abilities with my young horse. The birds also have places to live, other than just the Beach. They live not only on the beach but on Bird Island in the sound side, but of course they are not counted! This is the wrong bill to pass here! It will destroy many places here and make a harder living for the Original ISLANDERS here!

Correspondence ID: 12347 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hardison, Nancy K
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: May 2, 2010
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27952
Dear Mr. Murray:
My sister resides on Hatteras Island. Over the years, my children and myself have visited the Cape Hatteras National Seashore many times. I love the beauty of the island, and have enjoyed the experience of participating in many beach activities. I have many wonderful memories of watching my children learn to windsurf, kiteboard, and paddleboard at the beach. We enjoyed several evening bonfires after a day collecting seashells and playing at the shoreline. These experiences truely enriched our lives. I do not know of any other place where a family can have the opportunity to enjoy these activities together.
I feel that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area should be protected, but am now aware that with the NPS DEIS access to the beaches will be greatly decreased, and completely limited in some areas; therefore I am in disagreement with large inflexible buffers p.121-127.
I hope that the Recreational use of this Park is not destroyed.
Sincerely,
Nancy K. Hardison 5116 Blackwater Road Virginia Beach, VA 23457

Correspondence ID: 12348 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Swan, Linda
Received: May,10,2010 08:38:20
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: 12349 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hardison, Nancy K
Received: May,10,2010 08:39:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: May 10, 2010
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27952
Dear Mr. Murray:
My sister resides on Hatteras Island. Over the years, my children and myself have visited the Cape Hatteras National Seashore many times. I love the beauty of the island, and have enjoyed the experience of participating in many beach activities. I have many wonderful memories of watching my children learn to windsurf, kiteboard, and paddleboard at the beach. We enjoyed several evening bonfires after a day collecting seashells and playing at the shoreline. These experiences truely enriched our lives. I do not know of any other place where a family can have the opportunity to enjoy these activities together.
I feel that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area should be protected, but am now aware that with the NPS DEIS access to the beaches will be greatly decreased, and completely limited in some areas; therefore I am in disagreement with large inflexible buffers p.121-127.
I hope that the Recreational use of this Park is not destroyed.

Sincerely,
Nancy K. Hardison 5116 Blackwater Road Virginia Beach, VA 23457

Correspondence ID: 12350 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:46:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I've been going down to Cape Hatteras for over 35 years & have specifically enjoyed being able to go out on the beach at the Salvo ramps. I live on the Cheasapeake Bay in Va. Beach and unfortunately our beach is littered with tons of cigarette butts, plastic bottles, & dog poop whereas the Salvo beaches have always seemed litter free. I think a lot of the ORV users are very cognizant of the importance of a clean beach and are also very respectful of the wildlife that calls those beaches their home! On a sadder note some of the nicest people I've met are the locals who depend on the fishermen & surfers dollars to make a living. In the last few years many of the folks are no longer there because of declining numbers by people such as myself who really only visit so we can cast a line or catch a wave or two while having the convenience of having our vehicle only a few steps away!! After reviewing the plans I cast a vote for Plan C! Thank you for your consideration in this matter! Sincerely, Phil Curtin

Correspondence ID: 12351 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 08:47:46
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: 12352 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Floyd, Jerry M
Received: May,10,2010 08:48:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It seems to me that the Alternative F is a far too extreme measure. It results in some permanent closures to ORV use in prime fishing areas as well as other public use. Use by everyone should have their designated time and place allowing those who want to visit areas with no ORV use the opportunity to do so during specified times of year, and those who enjoy ORV use should likewise have full access during certain times of the year. Personally, I think the way the NPS has been handling resource closures and access by ORV users is working fine, so I see no reason to change it.
Until sound science is available to support further changes, the existing program should continue, or be adopted in a regulatory format. Also, I actively support the use of nest relocation for sea turtles as it seems to be the most viable means of effecting resource recovery. They do it in SC and FL all the time and have excellent results. The OBX seashore destruction due to storms is probably the biggest reason for turtle nest damages and loss, not ORV use.
Whatever is adopted, some common sense approaches need to be applied. Obviously, the most popular surf fishing periods are Late September thru December, so ORV traffic has to be available for that period with as limited resource closures as possible. The summer time has lots of beach goers, so ORV use should be more limited during those times due to the sheer numbers of folks that are there. People are not opposed to temporary closures at any time as long as there are some areas available for ORV use. You have to have some ORV use areas and simply work the resource closures around them. It shouldn't be that hard to figure out and the NPS has been doing a pretty good job so far. But these new measures are too extreme and need to be modified some more to better accommodate the ORV users.

Correspondence ID: 12353 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Dubec, Matt A
Received: May,10,2010 08:48:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully respect the fact that the preservation of wildlife is very important. Although, I also believe that allowing unconditional access to these beaches is far more important for our local economy and customs. Is there not a way to find some kind of balance rather than just blocking off access altogether? The absurdly large size of the current/proposed buffers seems irrational and also seems like a lazy way out of finding a solution that would truly work to make all parties content. I personally would like to carry on the uniqueness of beach access to my children and their children to come as well. Please take the time to re-consider the people and the beaches we so love.

Correspondence ID: 12354 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Dunnagan, mike g
Received: May,10,2010 08:48:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: - I don't agree with any portion of the DEIS. - Specifically: - Camp Lejeune N.C. has 9 endangered species on the base. One of these is the red cockaded woodpecker. When this bird nests it gets a 200 ft buffer zone. Please explain why a piping plover (not endangered) gets a thousand meters! Unless I'm mistaken the Marine Corps and NPS fall under the same federal guidelines. (pg 121-127) - Please explain why Hatteras Inlet is to be closed year around when historically there is little to no bird activity there. If it had not been closed there is a very good chance that the boat that flipped in the inlet last week would have been spotted and a human life would have been saved. - You do not adequately consider alternate areas for birds such as dredge and spoil islands. These would have much less impact on recreational activities. Please explain your thought process on this. (pg 124) - Why does NPS not adopt more proactive measures used at other east coast locations to encourage turtle nesting? Again, at Camp Lejeune, a turtle nest gets a

3' by 3' closure. Why are closures on Hatteras so extremely extensive? (pg 392-396) - I strongly urge you to look at Camp Lejeune's endangered species management plan. If their closures were as extensive as yours, the Marines would have precious little or no where to train. (pg 121-127) -Why not clear vegetation off the point and at the inlets to provide plenty of room for procreation as well as recreation? I will gladly volunteer my time to assist in this. - Why is the hook closed? Is it so people can't hear your trapper/shooter in there killing selected species? Who mandated you the right to play God with animals on Hatteras Island? - I strongly disagree with the prohibition of pets on the park at any time. If you enforce the restrictions you already have in place (6 ft leash) there won't be a problem. (pg 136) - Nowhere have you clearly addressed that the OVERWHELMING ECONOMIC IMPACT will be felt by the full time residents and businesses in the seashore villages within the region of influence. Why not?

Correspondence ID: 12355 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:49:32
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: 12356 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:49:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12357 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:49:40
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: 12358 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:50:28
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: 12359 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:50:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Get vehicles off of the beach!
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 12360 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:50:28
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: 12361 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:50:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 12362 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:50:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 12363 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:50:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 12364 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 08:50:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

Correspondence ID:	12365	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Minton, Marie S					
Received:	May,10,2010 08:51:20					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	As a property owner in Kinnakeet Shores, Avon, NC, and a Hatteras Island family visitor for close to 20 years, I fully support the Dare County DEIS Position Statement as outlined in their Position Statement Summary.					
Correspondence ID:	12366	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,10,2010 08:54:18					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Please do not allow vehicles on the beach - they disturb the natural setting, can add to pollution (noise and environmental impacts) as well as negatively impact my enjoyment of the beach.					
Correspondence ID:	12367	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Minton, Stephen M					
Received:	May,10,2010 08:54:36					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	As a property owner in Kinnakeet Shores in Avon, NC and family vacationer for close to 20 years, I fully support the Dare County DEIS Position Statement.					
Correspondence ID:	12368	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Reynolds, Renee					
Received:	May,10,2010 08:54:39					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	National parks, including beaches, must be kept safe for wildlife. Humans seem to think that no species is as important as their few moments of fun or pleasure. This is a bad idea for everyone. Vehicles have no place on a beach, where people walk, rest, look for peace and serenity. Passing this would be a lose/ lose proposition.					
Correspondence ID:	12369	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>First, I have visited the area several times since my sister and her husband live so close. I go to the parks for peace and quiet (tranquility) away from the city noise, cement and stress; I also enjoy the wildlife and birds, and they don't make much noise and are beautiful. To me, the beaches will be more damaged and a place that is not enjoyable. Let us (we the public) have a few places that are stress free and undamaged, except by mother nature. KEEP OUR PARKS BEAUTIFUL AND QUIET!</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason. "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>					
Correspondence ID:	12370	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,10,2010 08:56:36					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Please stop the Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. ORV's should not be allowed to destroy wildlife habitat and delicate ecosystems. Please protect our world, not destroy it.					

Thank you.

Correspondence ID:	12371	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 08:59:41						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>Sincerely, Jan W. Jones</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12372	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:00:41						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Our plans need to always be sustainably vigilant and to not do so is foolish						
Correspondence ID:	12373	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:05:37						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Why must we allow these otv to tear up and destroy our national lands... a few years of fun and then disaster for the land and wildlife. May I point out the sad state of Coral Pink Sand Dunes state park in Utah. Once home to a rare and delicate ecosystem. Now a basin of tire tracks and beer cans. The park rangers are armed to deal with the campers there. A second example is the land around the Anza Borrega Desert State Park in Borregs Springs CA.... beautiful desert land then noise ,oil and gas , and demolished landscape OTV's.</p> <p>Please consider preservation of the natural world.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12374	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:06:25						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	For anyone to believe they can admit off road vehicles to parks and not have damage to the environmentthey are just showing their stupidity and disregard for the environment. You pass this law and you will reemphasize my beliefs that man, (especially white men), destroy everything they touch.						
Correspondence ID:	12375	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:06:40						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12376	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	Bullock, Elizabeth L						

Received: May,10,2010 09:07:38
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.
 Sincerely, Elizabeth Bullock

Correspondence ID: 12377 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:12:30
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: 12378 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Koch, Joann M
Received: May,10,2010 09:12:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a supporter of both the National Parks Conservation Association and 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. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12379 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Myers, Eddy C
Received: May,10,2010 09:13:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Common sense goes a long way. There has been a successful historical access to beaches by vehicles. It is difficult for me to believe that common ground can not be reached so both sides can exist in harmony.

0012157

Correspondence ID: 12380 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:14:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off road vehicles disturb the quiet and disrupt the users more peaceful activities.

Correspondence ID: 12381 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As members of the National Parks Conservation Association and avid supporters of national parks, we appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, we fully support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points:
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, 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 appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. We look forward to seeing a vastly improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12382 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:15:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please. There are so few naturally beautiful places left for the animals to be safe and for people to find tranquility. If you allow these Noisy, smelly, dangerous vehicles on the beach and in the park, you have destroyed yet another haven that we have.
These vehicles will also cause pollution. Leaking oil and anti-freeze, they will poison the ground. Their huge unforgiving tires will rip the earth up and smash fragile eco-systems. The noise will drive the visitors away. Is this what you really want? Don't you see the world is beginning to perish? Please save this little slice of heaven from destruction. Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 12383 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:15:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Sir:
We have spent many vacations in your beautiful area. We do not want to learn that it has been destroyed by the use of ORVs. Please do all that you can to ensure this does not occur. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12384 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:15:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Supt. Murray
Please accept this letter as my comment5 on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Poaition Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Sincerely Nicholas M Belcastro

Correspondence ID: 12385 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Macomber, Brigit
Received: May,10,2010 09:16:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep ORV's out of Cape Hatteras beaches. These vehicles are destructive, disruptive, and antaganistic to wildlife, plantlife, air quality, and all others trying to enjoy this environment in responsible and non-destructive ways. Thank you for your time and consideration, Brigit Macomber.

Correspondence ID: 12386 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Snyder, Butch
Received: May,10,2010 09:17:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Vacationers and locals have the right to enjoy the beaches and have great respect for nesting areas. To my knowledge, this has been going on for decades and I cannot recall a single time that nesting areas have been disrespected.
Regulations have now been put in place to keep everyone off the Nationsl Seashore and Hatteras Island beaches during peak vacation and fishing seasons. I have seen no evidence that any nesting areas have intentionally been disturbed and certainly a compromise on using this land can be obtained if both parties on each side of this issue are willing to listen to the other.
The economy of the Outer Banks is suffering as is most of this great country and preventing public access will place further hardships on the locals

who's livelihoods depends on vacationer and their dollars.

I urge both sides of this issue to bring compromises to the table and work on a strategy to protect nesting and the people who love and respect the beauty of the OBX.

Correspondence ID: 12387 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Billington, Danielle D
Received: May,10,2010 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,
Danielle

Correspondence ID: 12388 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:17:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been visiting Cape Hatteras National Seashore for just over 25 years now. I first began when I was invited annually to vacation with friends. It then turned into vacationing with others and taking my own vacation down there. I now have the fortune of owning a home there. This allows my family to frequently go down there annually. My children, all under 15 years old, have had the pleasure of escaping the commercialism of most vacation areas and enjoying and appreciating the beauty of the Park as well as appreciating the value of playing on the beach all day and entertaining themselves with just good ole fashion fun with friends.
I disagree with the servery of the environmental protection actions with the current proposals. I believe the same goals can be reached for environmental preservation without sacrificing the economic livelihood of what is truly an American treasure. To strip this area of its historic fishing industry and tourism would be a sad commentary. Compromise and proper management/enforcement implementation can equate to all parties goals being attained.

Correspondence ID: 12389 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Alden, John S
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Coastal Conservation Association North Carolina wishes to comment on the recently released Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the ORV Management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area issued by the National Park Service. The objective of CCA is to conserve, promote and enhance the present and future availability of these coastal resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the general public. As such the thousands of members and volunteers of CCA NC and their nearly three quarters of a million associated recreational anglers are very disappointed in the six options for ORV management on CHNSRA. First of all the document itself is very difficult to follow in its 800+ pages. The tragedy is that none of the six options reflect the wishes of the vast majority of the CHNSRA visiting public and CCA NC. While there are preferred environmental and NPS options, there is no pro-access preferred option. The CHNSRA was established specifically for the American public to enjoy the seashore. To propose no option which provides a maximum access option certainly violates the spirit and perhaps the letter of the laws establishing this national park. Without serving the visiting public, The NPS has failed in its responsibility to our citizens. All the options presented in the DEIS seek to restrict public access well beyond any reasonable or legal requirement.
It is clear that significant facts have been ignored in the preparation of this DEIS. The success of turtle nesting and piping plover nesting and fledging is virtually unchanged since the de facto ORV plan was implemented in 1978. The primary causes of failed nesting and fledging are overwhelmingly predation and weather events which have occurred for hundreds of years. ORV caused mortality is a fraction of 1%. The USFWS and NPS personnel have caused more plover mortality. Yet, the NPS chooses to attack those users who are very sensitive to the wildlife in the CHNSRA.
The DEIS options all include restrictions which, when implemented as they have been under the consent decree, will unnecessarily close miles and miles of beach access both from the ocean and sound side. The many options describe no action which can circumvent a nesting closure in order to access an open area of the beach. Thus, while a stretch of waterfront may be "open" it is inaccessible. This represents nothing more than verbal trickery and masks the true available waterfront.
The specifics of option F, the NPS preferred option, require at least some comment as commenting on all options would extend beyond the available space and time constraints. Overall, the DEIS suggests there would be 52 of 68 miles of the waterfront "open" to ORV access but it is not clear that this includes any calculation of sound side access for ORVs or pedestrians. CCA NC strongly believes the "buffer" or closure areas suggested for piping plovers in various stages of nesting and fledging are beyond excessive. For nesting piping plovers 50 meters is more than adequate and as is 200 meters for unfledged chicks. To suggest that unfledged chicks of a bird that is less than 1 foot tall requires over a mile of seashore is ludicrous! All this with no pass through or corridor around these areas closes vast areas of the CHNSRA to the American public. All other shore birds should be allocated no more than 30m for nesting and 30m for unfledged chicks with pass through corridors as there is no legal requirement to provide excessive buffers. In addition, the NPS fails to recognize the role played by the spoil islands behind Bodie Island, Hatteras Island, Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge and Ocracoke Island in the breeding of shore birds. These areas are typically with a few hundred yards of the CHNSRA and harbor large populations of shore birds. If the NPS truly wants to help the population of piping plovers they should investigate the usage of large cages placed around the nests to keep predators out of the nests. These are used in the Northeast where the major piping plover nesting takes place. The NPS and the USFWS seem content to kill hundreds of other wildlife to try to protect piping plovers but refuse to implement simpler techniques improve shore bird breeding success while

improving access as well.

Option F describes measures required to "improve turtle breeding success". Many of the restrictions described in option F have little basis in peer reviewed science. For example, there is no evidence that night driving of ORVs has any impact on turtle nesting or hatchling survival. There have been no female turtles killed by ORVs. To protect turtle nests and improve hatchling success, CCA NC recommends relocation of turtle nests when they are laid in areas exposed to weather events. Using the fences used on the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge that are keyhole shaped are more effective for turtle hatchlings and would allow continued use of ORVs at night.

The surf zone of CHNSRA has been used for a hundred years for the purposes of swimming, sunbathing, fishing, birding and shelling. ORV usage is critical to the pursuit of these activities as much of the surf zone would be inaccessible without ORVs. The NPS, throughout the DEIS, seeks only to restrict ORV usage without proposing ways to improve access for ORVs and providing expanded habitat for those species which are threatened or endangered. It seems the NPS has forgotten the CHNSRA was established as a recreation area. Pea Island National Wildlife Sanctuary is for wildlife, yet under the de facto rules in place from 1978, there has been little difference in the successful breeding of piping plovers or endangered sea turtles. CCA NC urges you to revert to those rules put in place in 1978 to provide maximum access for ORVs and the American citizens.

Correspondence ID: 12390 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:19:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
I lived and worked on the Outer Banks for many years. During that time I witnessed the disappearance of many beach nesting bird colonies on both Hatteras and Ocracoke islands. It is clear that the National Park Service is not doing an adequate job of protecting wildlife and their habitats when it comes to the beach.
While providing for recreational use may be part of the mission of Cape Hatteras National Seashore, that does not mean un restricted use of all areas at the expense of wildlife. ORVs should be kept out of areas that are important to wildlife. The entire seashore should be evaluated for its potential wildlife value and people should be kept out of prime bird nesting areas.
At Cape Cod National Seashore, it was found that the more area ORVs were restricted from, the more habitat was utilized by piping plovers. At Assateague Island National Seashore, ORVS are kept off a large portion of the beach throughout the entire bird nesting season. The lack of and adequate policy at Cape Hatteras NS is a black mark upon the Service's record. For years management at CAHA has failed to protect the wildlife which has been entrusted to it. The time has come for bold action. Service managers need to stand up to the bullies in the ORV special intersst groups and do the right thing for wildlife. The national seashore belongs to everyone. It was created to protect the beautiful beaches of coastal North Carolina for the enjoyment of future generations. Without the colonies of nesting birds the seashore will be but a shadow of its original self and the NPS will have failed in the mission given it by the American people.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12391 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:19:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
Dear Superintendent Murray,
I am grateful to be able to submit comments on this very important issue. I lived and worked in Dare County in 1981 and 1982 and my family has vacationed on the Outer Banks - renting houses from Carova to Ocrakoke for many years. The area that I cherish most is the area south of the Bonner Bridge to the southern tip of Hatteras. We are all very lucky that the federal government had the foresight to preserve the natural areas on these outer banks by establishing National Parks. I think we all probably realize that, had this not been done, we would be looking at miles of condos, houses and strip malls.
I have been aware of the controversy over the use of ORV's on the beach for several years. The anger and vehemence of some of the people who think they have an automatic right to drive on the beach as they please is, quite frankly, scary.
I know that the Park Service has sought to come up with a plan that is reasonable for everyone who uses the beach and, at the same time, protective of the natural coastal environment.
I am writing to urge the Park Service to select Alternative D which will provide and protect use of the beach by those of use who use the beach for walking, swimming, sunning, relaxing and spending time with our families - for simple enjoyment of the natural beauty of a beach which has not been developed.
I have always had concerns about the impacts on the beach and on wildlife caused by driving on the beach. I know that many people take this privilege for granted and are entrenched in their opposition to even limited restrictions.
My husband and I enjoy surf fishing. I have fished in the surf since I was a child. But, we do not feel the need to drive to the very spot that we want to fish and are willing to walk - even at a distance - to get to the place where we want to fish.
I also enjoy bird-watching and have made many trips to the Hatteras National Seashore to bird. I am keenly aware of the need to protect nesting areas of the piping plover, oystercatchers, skimmers and other shore birds. Please, whatever you do, protect these species by prohibiting ORV beach-driving in nesting areas AT LEAST during nesting season.
Please select the option which will most protect the precious natural resource that we all enjoy and limit ORF access to the greatest "reasonable" extent.
Thank you for this opportunity. I understand that those in favor of getting the most access for ORF's have campaigned to get a large number of comments in favor of their position. I think we all know that these types of campaigns don't necessarily reflect the most thoughtful alternative or protect the greater public interest.
My understanding is that the Park Service is leaning towards Alternative F, but I believe that this alternative does not adequately protect enjoyment and use for non-driving beach-goers and for protection of wildlife and habitat. Those of us whose enjoyment is disturbed by ORV use should be able to have available year round at least half the beach for non-ORV use and wildlife. Beach walkers and families - who pay hard-earned money to the local economy - would be able to safely enjoy this national public treasure and protect it for future users.
Sincerely,
Jane Oliver 446 Henley Road Chapel Hill, NC 27517

Correspondence ID: 12392 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:19:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12393 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 09:19:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12394 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 09:19:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12395 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 09:20:29

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: 12396 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:20:29
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: 12397 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:20:30
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: 12398 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: wojcik, robert a
Received: May,10,2010 09:20:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live in Richmond, Va. but I have a non-rental home in Salvo, NC 27219 Ocean Spray, Salvo NC. I visit as often as possible for I love the fishing and the time on the beach. My life loves the beach and the shelling. I am most distraught with the process esp. the lies being posted by the Defenders of Wildlife and the Audubon society. I now have little feeling of what the American Indian went through. End this ludicrous process and do what is correct for the inhabitants of Hatteras Island and the guest to this island. I am tired of hearing about those who want changes and never been to this island.
I am opposed to all the present ideas posted by the NPS. They have failed us miserably. The research is not reliable because there have been no validation by a proper research group. The NPS wants to close areas and esp. points that have never had a Piping Plover. The distances being permitted by the NPS are over kill in comparison to what other NPS have done. No bird needs a thousand meters or 70 plus acres. The indiscriminate killing of other animals.
Man kills less than 3% of the birds and percentage of this is by those banding the birds. You have stated that 80% of the bird population is killed by other predators, ground and air, and weather. Weather is a key factor in bird population decline on the outer banks.
I am 63 with one bad knee and I cannot see myself walking over the dunes carrying the stuff needed. Walking in sand swells my knee quicker than

anything else I walk on.

I cannot trust the NPS even when it comes to handicap access. At South Beach, mile post 43.4 the last street in Salvo the NPS permitted a gentleman to build a ramp to the dunes if it was made accessible to the public. That ramp is not handicap accessible. This occurred soon after my son had met with Mike Murrays office and they stated they were committed to access for the handicap. So much for their promises, all my son wanted was a way to drive his wheel chair to the dunes so he could observe the ocean. This ramp is one street from our house. If I cannot trust the NPS to do follow handicap laws then what can I expect when it comes to running our beaches.

Do what is right for the citizens of America and as a veteran of the Vietnam War I wanted freedom, not what I am seeing now. Defenders of Wildlife have ruined the process and are guiding the NPS, NPS stand up for America and do what is correct - open the beaches!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Robert A. Wojcik rwojck@reynolds.edu

Correspondence ID: 12399 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:20:35
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: 12400 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:20:35
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: 12401 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:20:36
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:	12402	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:20:36						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12403	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:20:36						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12404	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	
Name:	Norris, Michael A						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:21:36						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I think that Alternative F is a little extreme. In particular, I have these concerns: Why are leashed dogs c at any time. A dog that is leashed is under the control of its owner and cannot endanger wildlife. In general I feel the ORV restrictions go too far. Man and nature have co-existed here for many years. As business owners my fiance and I depend on tourists who come to our island expect ORV beach access. I disagree with the night driving ban...fishermen should be allowed access to the beach before dawn. The traffic will not be nearly as heavy as late in the day and should not effect it much, if any. I realize that there must be compromise but let it come from all sides and let common sense prevail!</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12405	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>My family and I have greatly enjoyed the National Parks over the years, appreciating the multitude of opportunities to experience the diversity of our great nation in its natural state. We continue to work on our goal of visiting ALL 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.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 						

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12406 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cox, Chadwick
Received: May,10,2010 09:24:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 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.

Correspondence ID: 12407 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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. Personally, having seen (and heard) the destruction that ORV can do to an area, I am amazed and disappointed that you would even consider allowing them in Cape Hatteras. This is not Daytona nor your local road track. The noise alone is enough to disturb not only humans but certainly any wildlife that is present. JUST WHAT WERE YOU THINKING TO EVEN CONSIDER THIS? ***** 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,
VIRGINIA C. MARS

Correspondence ID: 12408 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:27:17
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: 12409 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a frequent user 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 storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to fulfill the mission of the National Park Service. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

- 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 - 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 - 3) The final Plan/EIS must 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) As a pediatrician I am acutely aware of our children's need for safe and healthy physical activity. Promoting ORV use sends precisely the wrong message. Park policies should support activities that will engage families with children in physical activity that burns calories, not fossil fuels.
- Sincerely, Claudia C Prose MD MPH Chapel Hill NC

Correspondence ID: 12410 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Harris, James
Received: May,10,2010 09:32:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: DEIS COMMENT 5 10 10
I support this work of Larry Hardham & Bob Davis, they have spent many years finding a solution for the turtle problem in CHNSRA.
<http://www.obpa-nc.org/turtles/TurtleMgmtProgram.pdf>
The above paper goes into the reasons the NPS has failed to do the job they were tasked to do by USFWS & NCWRC. CHNSRA turtle biologists have allowed almost half of the turtle nests laid in this Park to simply fail because they decided to take no action.
Nowhere else in the Loggerhead turtle breeding range, has so little been done to so many turtles. Cape Hatteras National Seashore is the laughing stock of other National Parks.
Other Seashores can say; "at least we are not doing what CHNSRA is doing" as a reply that they (other Seashores) need to do more for protection.
Take responsibility for your failures and fix the glaring lack action, it is the least you can do.
Jim Harris 92 South Dogwood Tr. Southern Shores NC 27949-3838 252 261 4990

Correspondence ID: 12411 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:33:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think it is disgusting what is being done to the people who rely on the fishermen and sightseers for their livelihood. All for what, a few birds that were surviving just fine. The Audubon and Parks service are shameful, bitter people. How many other animals have been killed to so call save these birds??? DISGUSTING!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 12412 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:34:02
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: 12413 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:34:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: DEIS COMMENT 5 10 10 NESTING AMOY & PLOVER
Plover & Oyster-catcher chicks are "precocial." From what I read from your biologists, once these chicks hatch, they never try to get back into their eggshells. With the empty shell being useless, the nest the shell fragments are in is also useless. It means nothing to the chicks.
I can't find a reason why bird biologists hold the nest site sacred until these chicks are killed by nature, or fledge and fly away. I observe that the majority of nests are not close to the main food sources. Is that because the eggs do not flee as well as a chick does in the presence of a predator?
Do the parents built their nests in precarious locations because predators hold the high ground?
The nest site doesn't need to be protected after the chicks hatch, as they have no reason to hold it dear. When the adults lead the chicks on the long hot march to food, do they look back at the nest?
Jim Harris 92 South Dogwood Tr. Southern Shores NC 27949-3838 252 261 4990

Correspondence ID:	12414	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:38:20						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	The North Carolina State-listed "species of concern," - such as the American oystercatcher - do not require the extensive buffers and beach closures mandated for federally listed species such as the piping plover. The piping plover is the only seashore bird species protected under the federal Endangered Species Act. The 1,000-meter buffers required in all directions around an unfledged piping plover chick is not based on any scientific reasoning behind this management strategy. A more reasonable buffer would be 200 meters and in line with buffers used in other northeast coastal states. The resource closures are so large that, in some cases, they block access to open beach for not only ORVs but also for beachcombers, surfers, horseback riders, anglers and swimmers and severely limits access by the handicapped. Corridors around closures so public access to open beaches can be maintained, and decrease buffers for non threatened species from 300 meters to 30 meters need to be enacted. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore was established for the benefit of the people.						
Correspondence ID:	12415	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:39:48						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I am a property owner in Rodanthe as well as a frequent user of the beaches of the Outer Banks. I strongly oppose strict restrictions to the enjoyment of our North Carolina beaches. I support environmental protection, but I believe a compromise can be reached to accomodate both objectives.						
Correspondence ID:	12416	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	CLARKE-ROBERTS, RACHEL						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:40:34						
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:	12417	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Hoerter, Jamie D						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:40:35						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very much against allowing off road vehicles in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We put that land aside to preserve it and that is your responsibility. Please keep orv's out. We need to start taking care of the protected areas we have left. Thank you for listening. Jamie Hoerter						
Correspondence ID:	12418	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Finley, George B						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:45:40						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I disagree with the 1000 meter buffer in all directions for an unfledged piping plover brood. Audubon Society recommends 200 meters for a safe buffer. I disagree with any buffer for birds that are not on the federal threatened or endangered list. It is not the job of the Park Service to use State watch lists against the park users. I disagree with the size and duration of the buffer for sea turtles. I disagree with the Park Service plans to try to introduce extinct plants into the park. They are not here for a reason. We don't know that they were ever here. I disagree that night driving on the beach be prohibited for a large part of the tourist season. I disagree with option F						
Correspondence ID:	12419	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:46:53						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I go to the beach for relaxation and quiet not to listen to noisy vehicles. I do not want to be run over by someone on an ORV that that suddenly comes over a hill and did not see me walking up the hill. In addition the environmental damage done by ORVs cannot be undone for many years - and in some cases never.						
Correspondence ID:	12420	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:48:23						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						

Correspondence:

Dear National Park Service,

As a lifelong visitor to the Outer Banks of North Carolina, myself and my family have a deep appreciation for the beauty and natural resources of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. In regards to the ORV Management Plan, I urge you to fully consider the importance of the recreational users, and fellow taxpayers and supporters of the National Seashores and Park. Beach vehicle access is an important asset of not only the Seashore but the well being of the entire economy and the residents of the Outer Banks. If beach vehicle use is significantly reduced or eliminated, the entire Outer Banks region will suffer from the ill effects of reduced tourist interest.

In your review of ORV Access, please place an emphasis on the economic and emotional aspect of reducing beach vehicle access. The over whelming majority of users appreciate the National Seashore and Parks, and leave them a better place than they found them.

Sincerely,
David B. Goode

Correspondence ID: 12421 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:48:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not believe that the NPS should select the most restrictive alternative, alternative F. This alternative is even more restrictive than the current decree filed in April 2008. The NC outer banks is a unique environment and beach access makes our beached more unique. My family and friends have always treasured the ability to drive on the beaches. This is unique to the outerbanks and restricting this ability would be detrimental to all visitors to these beaches. The current restrictions proposed by the NPS are excessive. Please allow the owners, thier families, guests and visitors the right to enjoy the outerbanks as it has always been cherished.
Thank you, Ben Micham and family

Correspondence ID: 12422 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:49:27
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 oppportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12423 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
I do not get to visit the outer banks as much as I would like, but the park one of the most beautiful ocean sites that I have visited. The birds and turtles were there first, and need to have some protection from humans. People were born with 2 feet for walking, and unless they have a disability, and can't experience the national seashore any other way, ORV use should not be allowed. They only harm the animals that live and breed there.
This alternative plan would provide more oppportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12424 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 09:49:32
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: 12425 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:49:32
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: 12426 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:49:32
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: 12427 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 09:50:38
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: 12428 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:50:38
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: 12429 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:50:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 12430 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 09:50:56
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: 12431 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Judd, Lil Y

Received: May,10,2010 09:52:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

Mrs. Lil Judd

Correspondence ID: 12432 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Francis, Ross H

Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

The Coastal Conservation Association North Carolina wishes to comment on the recently released Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the ORV Management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area issued by the National Park Service. The objective of CCA is to conserve, promote and enhance the present and future availability of these coastal resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the general public. As such the thousands of members and volunteers of CCA NC and their nearly three quarters of a million associated recreational anglers are very disappointed in the six options for ORV management on CHNSRA. First of all the document itself is very difficult to follow in its 800+ pages. The tragedy is that none of the six options reflect the wishes of the vast majority of the CHNSRA visiting public and CCA NC. While there are preferred environmental and NPS options, there is no pro-access preferred option. The CHNSRA was established specifically for the American public to enjoy the seashore. To propose no option which provides a maximum access option certainly violates the spirit and perhaps the letter of the laws establishing this national park.

Without serving the visiting public, The NPS has failed in its responsibility to our citizens. All the options presented in the DEIS seek to restrict public access well beyond any reasonable or legal requirement. It is clear that significant facts have been ignored in the preparation of this DEIS. The success of turtle nesting and piping plover nesting and fledging is virtually unchanged since the de facto ORV plan was implemented in 1978. The primary causes of failed nesting and fledging are overwhelmingly predation and weather events which have occurred for hundreds of years. ORV caused mortality is a fraction of 1%. The USFWS and NPS personnel have caused more plover mortality. Yet, the NPS chooses to attack those users who are very sensitive to the wildlife in the CHNSRA. The DEIS options all include restrictions which, when implemented as they have been under the consent decree, will unnecessarily close miles and miles of beach access both from the ocean and sound side. The many options describe no action which can circumvent a nesting closure in order to access an open area of the beach. Thus, while a stretch of waterfront may be "open" it is inaccessible. This represents nothing more than verbal trickery and masks the true available waterfront. The specifics of option F, the NPS preferred option, require at least some comment as commenting on all options would extend beyond the available space and time constraints. Overall, the DEIS suggests there would be 52 of 68 miles of the waterfront "open" to ORV access but it is not clear that this includes any calculation of sound side access for ORVs or pedestrians. CCA NC strongly believes the "buffer" or closure areas suggested for piping plovers in various stages of nesting and fledging are beyond excessive. For nesting piping plovers 50 meters is more than adequate and as is 200 meters for unfledged chicks. To suggest that unfledged chicks of a bird that is less than 1 foot tall requires over a mile of seashore is ludicrous! All this with no pass through or corridor around these areas closes vast areas of the CHNSRA to the American public. All other shore birds should be allocated no more than 30m for nesting and 30m for unfledged chicks with pass through corridors as there is no legal requirement to provide excessive buffers. In addition, the NPS fails to recognize the role played by the spoil islands behind Bodie Island, Hatteras Island, Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge and Ocracoke Island in the breeding of shore birds. These areas are typically with a few hundred yards of the CHNSRA and harbor large populations of shore birds. If the NPS truly wants to help the population of piping plovers they should investigate the usage of large cages placed around the nests to keep predators out of the nests. These are used in the Northeast where the major piping plover nesting takes place. The NPS and the USFWS seem content to kill hundreds of other wildlife to try to protect piping plovers but refuse to implement simpler techniques improve shore bird breeding success while improving access as well. Option F describes measures required to "improve turtle breeding success". Many of the restrictions described in option F have little basis in peer reviewed science. For example, there is no evidence that night driving of ORVs has any impact on turtle nesting or hatchling survival. There have been no female turtles killed by ORVs. To protect turtle nests and improve hatchling success, CCA NC recommends relocation of turtle nests when they are laid in areas exposed to weather events. Using the fences used on the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge that are keyhole shaped are more effective for turtle hatchlings and would allow continued use of ORVs at night. The surf zone of CHNSRA has been used for a hundred years for the purposes of swimming, sunbathing, fishing, birding and shelling. ORV usage is critical to the pursuit of these activities as much of the surf zone would be inaccessible without ORVs. The NPS, throughout the DEIS, seeks only to restrict ORV usage without proposing ways to improve access for ORVs and providing expanded habitat for those species which are threatened or endangered. It seems the NPS has forgotten the CHNSRA was established as a recreation area. Pea Island National Wildlife Sanctuary is for wildlife, yet under the de facto rules in place from 1978, there has been little difference in the successful breeding of piping

plovers or endangered sea turtles. CCA NC urges you to revert to those rules put in place in 1978 to provide maximum access for ORVs and the American citizens.

Correspondence ID:	12433	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Fritch, James						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:54:32						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12434	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:56:51						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	As the daughter of a Coast Guard Captain, I love Cape Hatteras, its story, and the escape it offers from the stress of modern noise, rush, pollution, and bad smells. Please preserve some peace for those of us who love nature. Do not allow off-rad vehicles in this precious area.						
Correspondence ID:	12435	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:58:07						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I am a North Carolina resident, have fished to Outer Banks for 50+ years, am a scientist and an environmental consultant, as such I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to use Alternative A in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. The previously used Interim Plan provided both. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV.</p> <p>Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures. There is no scientific evidence that these huge resource closure areas are needed. Indeed, there are studies that have shown that proximity to humans reduces predation to the point that survival rates are higher.</p> <p>In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Please stand up to the environmental extremist that have sued you and counter them with science and reason. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the chosen alternative.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12436	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:58:56						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	There are so few places that are undisturbed by noise, pollution, etc. Please allow this are to stay protected from vehicles and noise and pollution that goes along with the latter. June Maselli						
Correspondence ID:	12437	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Mutafchiev, Ivo						
Received:	May,10,2010 09:59:53						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Keep vehicles away from the Cape Hateras National Seashore ! People may want to be able to drive through the halls of the White House next, but that doesn't make it right. Maybe if people weren't driving everywhere, obesity would not be so common !						
Correspondence ID:	12438	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 10:01:09						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please do not destroy our Island. Please work to make a better plan, and don't close the beaches. The birds are not even endangered, so what is the point of protecting? Do you know that a gentle man drown last Saturday right next to Hatteras Inlet closure, he would not have it the beaches were open because the people on the beach would have seen the boat he was on capsized. Not even thousands of birds are worth one human life. It is a shame, and the NPS should be ashamed to have the wrongful death of that man, Mr. Aaron, on their hands!!!						

Correspondence ID:	12439	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 10:03:57						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I disagree with a number of proposed changes with the NPS preferred alternative.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I disagree with not allowing even leashed pets on the beach at certain times of the year. If a pet is leashed, it is under the control of the owner and presents no more risk than a child on the beach to wildlife. 2. I disagree with the complete elimination of ORV's at night at certain times of year. One of key uses of the part is fishing 'at sunrise'. The proposal eliminates this use of the park at certain times of the year. 3. I disagree with a 1000' buffer for piping plovers. The buffer size is puntative and unnecessary for protection of wildlife. A smaller buffer can be used with appropriate signage and rope as needed. 4. I disagree with the total elimination of pedestrian access from march to july at many locations. Pedestrian access can be managed with signage and ropes and appropriately sized buffer zones to ensure chicks and broods are safe. 						
Correspondence ID:	12440	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>1) After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Poaition Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. (2)I disagree with the extreme buffers outlined in DEIS pages 121 to 127. They must be modified to substantially reduce the minimum 1,000 meter buffer in all directions required in Alternative F for unfledged Piping Plover chicks. Dare County believes a more appropriate and yet effective buffer is 200 meters. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. (3) I agree with the Coalition for Beach Access position statement on the DEIS. I do not believe the DEIS adequately addressed the cultural significance of access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12441	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12442	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 10:06:19						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I disagree with a number of proposed changes with the NPS preferred alternative.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I disagree with not allowing even leashed pets on the beach at certain times of the year. If a pet is leashed, it is under the control of the owner and presents no more risk than a child on the beach to wildlife. 2. I disagree with the complete elimination of ORV's at night at certain times of year. One of key uses of the part is fishing 'at sunrise'. The proposal eliminates this use of the park at certain times of the year. 3. I disagree with a 1000' buffer for piping plovers. The buffer size is puntative and unnecessary for protection of wildlife. A smaller buffer can be used with appropriate signage and rope as needed. 4. I disagree with the total elimination of pedestrian access from march to july at many locations. Pedestrian access can be managed with signage and ropes and appropriately sized buffer zones to ensure chicks and broods are safe. 						
Correspondence ID:	12443	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 10:07:01						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>My family and I have been enjoying Cape Hatteras for 30 years. We enjoy the beach and the wildlife. Restricting access to the beach has hurt the local business. I think the animals should be protected by a 700 foot boundary for each brood is excessive. Not having access to the beach will change the entire way of life on Hatteras Island, destroy the economy. We own a rental property in Avon and have noticed a decline in our rentals with the beach closings. Restricting access to the beach for large areas will keep people from returning to rent. I think a much smaller area could be used. Please consider the small people who make their living from the tourists.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12444	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	
Name:	N/A, N/A						

Received: May,10,2010 10:08:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: please do the right thing!

Correspondence ID: 12445 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Grace, Paul
Received: May,10,2010 10:09:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: DONT LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!

Correspondence ID: 12446 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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 unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) The intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12447 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: jereb, linda & jim
Received: May,10,2010 10:10:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a former 20 year resident of the The Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce,I vehemently disagrees with the validity of the economic impact analysis included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for proposed new rules for access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Not only does the analysis not adequately convey the economic impact of the proposed Alternative F, it fails to address any of the alternatives listed in the DEIS. The data is incomplete,misleading and the statements of what are supposed to be facts are without sound basis.
This is truly a beautiful and unique area BECAUSE people are allowed access. You will destroy the Outer Banks way of life if you find in favor of birds over people!

Correspondence ID: 12448 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:11:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We are opposed to further drilling for oil on United States lands or in offshore waters.

Correspondence ID: 12449 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:11:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a former 20 year residents of the The Outer Banks, We vehemently disagree with the validity of the economic impact analysis included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for proposed new rules for access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Not only does the analysis not adequately convey the economic impact of the proposed Alternative F, it fails to address any of the alternatives listed in the DEIS. The data is incomplete,misleading and the statements of what are supposed to be facts are without sound basis.
This is truly a beautiful and unique area BECAUSE people are allowed access. You will destroy the Outer Banks way of life if you find in favor of birds over people!

Correspondence ID: 12450 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:13:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We are opposed to allowing off road vehicles on public beach areas.

Correspondence ID: 12451 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:14:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been visiting the Outer Banks of NC since I was a child. I have spent every vacation there since I was in grade school. I have spent considerable amounts of money on each trip and fish from the shore, boats, and piers from Kitty Hawk to Hatteras. I feel the NPS must protect the taxpayers right to use our own land. We must keep our access to driving on the beach, it is our land and our right.
Thank you
Chris M Jones

Correspondence ID: 12452 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: dunivan, david
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Superintendent Murray: We are writing you today to make formal comments on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement, specifically Alternative F, created by the National Park Service with input from the negotiated rulemaking advisory committee. Before commenting on the contents of the document, we would like to call attention to the shocking exclusion of useful data to determine the potential economic impact of Alternative F. The DEIS suggests "F" will have revenue impacts on small businesses "at the low end of the estimated range rather than the high end." From our conversations with small business owners on Hatteras Island, any restriction in access will have severe economic impacts to their families, as the closures in the past years have. In an already disastrous economy, the actions taken by the Court and the Service have proved devastating to all businesses and residents on Hatteras Island. For anyone to claim differently would be either a misguided statement of ignorance or just a pure falsification of the truth. The last names of the original settlers of Hatteras Island can be found in the phonebook to this day. These families have been rooted in this community even before the founding of our nation. Today, their livelihoods are being threatened by that government. After consulting with the elected leaders of Dare County, we would like to comment on the four critical aspects of the DEIS, the first being the vitally important management tool of corridors. In the past during a closure, our offices were able to work with you and your staff to create corridors around resource closures. These alternative paths are indispensable to the continued movement of pedestrians and vehicles. Also, the corridors allow visitors to access an open area that may be sandwiched between two closed areas. These corridors have limited negative impacts to the protected species, but they are crucial to providing access during closure periods. We stand with Dare County in requesting that corridors be maintained for pedestrians and vehicles in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Page 2 May 4, 2010 NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY ? RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA When reviewing the management of any wildlife species by the state of North Carolina, anyone can see our management plans are based on reliable and reputable science and data. Political whims are not entered into the formula for the management of species by our State. We are concerned that political inclination is the reason for and basis of the management buffers within the DEIS. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions of an unfledged piping plover chick represents 771 acres of closed beach. This seems a bit arbitrary and capricious when managing a species. We have yet to read any scientific reasoning behind this management strategy. We would argue a buffer of 200 meters would be just as effective for the survival of a piping plover chick without the extreme penalization of the residents and visitors of Hatteras Island. Another confusing issue in the buffers listed in the DEIS is the equal and even more protective status given to species not on the endangered species list. Birds listed as North Carolina species of concern should not be given protected status under the Endangered Species Act. We have spoken with both the Chairman and Executive Director of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission regarding this matter. Both have informed us that these unnecessary protections were never the intent of the Commission's participation in this process, nor a requested outcome. They have also informed us that other species of concern are not given ESA status on other federal lands. Pre-nesting closures should be exclusively for the piping plover, the only federally listed threatened bird species. Also, non-ESA listed birds should not have buffers of 300 meters. The county feels a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. We also spoke with NCWRC regarding the inclusion of all birds in the ecosystem being counted when doing any type of management plan. Currently, birds on dredge spoil islands located adjacent to the Park are not being included in the population figures. They agree these islands have no predation and are ideal locations for nesting. To not include the populations of these islands is disingenuous to the intent of this process. The last technical portion of our comments centers on the treatment of the nests of endangered sea turtles within the Seashore. We would urge the Park Service to allow for the relocation of nests to higher beach elevations. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service practices this management tool in Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge, as do other management agencies on state and federal lands. The Seashore has lost over 46% of the nests laid in the last 11 years, while South Carolina relocated 40.1% of their nests during 2009, finishing the year with only a 7.7% loss of nests. To not allow for the relocation of nests puts both the users of the parks and the turtle hatchlings at competitive disadvantages. The key to any management plan is flexibility. Without the ability to change user patterns while keeping access open, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area will become but a memory to generations of users from across the globe. We would say that nowhere in our great nation can individuals enjoy the beauty and serenity of our coast as in the Seashore. For decades, families have been coming to Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands to utilize this area as President Roosevelt envisioned. Page 2 May 4, 2010 I strongly support the views and comments of Senator Basnight and Dare County Government as outlined in this letter.
Sincerely, David Dunvan

Correspondence ID: 12453 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Swartz, Neil R
Received: May,10,2010 10:15:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I strongly disagree with the information and recommendations contained in the alternative F presentation. I have found the Coalition For Beach Access position statement more factual, realistic, and practical. The Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce economic impact statement also addresses the financial concerns much more effectively than alternative F. These two statements should be used as a basis for formulating a new and better policy regarding the future usage of the Cape Hatteras National Recreation Area. Thank You

Correspondence ID: 12454 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Oliver, Jim U
Received: May,10,2010 10:16:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Use of vehicles on beaches to access remote areas and camping/fishing/vacationing opportunities is a common practice in some coastal areas of NC. Whether pro-recreational vehicular use on the beach or against, no one wants to see this biologically fragile terrain degraded. Many of these environmentally sensitive areas are beyond the protective safety net of federal regulation. Cape Hatteras NP is a small part of the NC coastline that can be protected, and therefore should be.
The present calamity in the Gulf of Mexico surrounding the BP's Lease 206 at Deepwater Horizon shows the futility of mankind's ability to predict accidental environmental harm from our endeavors. The US Dept of Interior exempted BP's Gulf of Mexico drilling operation from a detailed environmental impact analysis last year, after three reviews of the area concluded that a massive oil spill was unlikely. Consequently, BP was allowed, in effect, to police itself.
WHOOOPS.
OVR users want the same "rights" that BP has in the Gulf...to use "The People's" resources while being allowed to police themselves: "Just give us access and we promise not to drive when and where we really REALLY want to drive!"
Turtles? WHOOOPS.
Piping Plover Nests? WHOOOPS.
Granny? WHOOOPS.
Seriously, all efforts to protect our planet are really just semi-uneducated guesses. Alternative D appears to provide the most restrictions on ORV use therefore insures the greatest predictability of environmental consequences.
I want ORV access our beaches to be controlled/regulated as much as legally possible: to minimize the potential for environmental harm. I urge the NPS to manage Hatteras National Seashore with a view toward limiting any vehicle impact foot print on the shore, thereby limiting the level of environmental impact. Given the options: I urge adoption of Alternative D.
-Jim Oliver

Correspondence ID: 12455 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:16:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am an avid outdoorsman. I enjoy everything the outdoors has to offer. Beaches to the Mountains the outdoors offers so much in the form of activities and entertainment for adults and children alike. I believe it is important to protect the outdoors and its inhabitants with all resources available. At the same time it is equally as important to protect our ability to access these areas. They are for everyone to see and enjoy. If there is a medium ground that can be achieved that will show promise for continued wildlife growth and well being as well as support vehicle traffic so that others can easily enjoy what the outdoors has to offer there should be no expense to great to come to such a resolution. To say we have to further restrict beach access in order to better protect the local wildlife needs to be examined very carefully.
 I would hate to see further restrictions as far as access is concerned unless everyone can be assured that there is no other reasonable alternative.

Correspondence ID: 12456 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: woods, roth
Received: May,10,2010 10:17:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am 64 years old now, but as a child my family vacationed on Nags Head and visited Cape Hatteras yearly. These were in the days when you could see no one on the beaches. Unfortunately we can not turn back time enough to eliminate man's population of such pristine beauty, but we can take better care of what we still have. So please do what is right for now and future years. Keep the area clean, clear and beautiful! I beg of you.

Correspondence ID: 12457 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Herro, Rebecca M
Received: May,10,2010 10:17:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12458 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:17:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I request that corridors be maintained for pedestrians and vehicles in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. A buffer of 200 meters would be just as effective for the survival of a piping plover chick without the extreme penalization of the residents and visitors of Hatteras Island. People matter too! Keep our beaches open!

Correspondence ID: 12459 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Meyer, Tito
Received: May,10,2010 10:17:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 As a person who enjoyed camping at Cape Hatteras as a child, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12460 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:18:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have only 1 thing to say, My grandfather is A disabled vet and only has 1 leg so you know he cant walk in the sand because of the age and,the leg his 1 passion is fishing the outer banks of nc if A law is passed where no vehicles can drive on beaches he will simply not go anymore and hopefully find somewhere where he can get to get back on the beaches again.....

Correspondence ID: 12461 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

When my wife and I travel to Cape Hatteras, we do not go to watch people tear up the ocean side with their ORV abuse. We go to see the wildlife that utilizes this unique National Seashore and to experience the tranquility conveyed by the setting. We have frequently had our experience ruined by ORV use and ask that you set aside additional areas to be ORV-free zones, accessible only by foot traffic. The unique wildlife that utilizes these areas will expand in population, attracting more visitors to this wonderful 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: 12462 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 10:19:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12463 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 10:20:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I disagree with the National Park Service current policy of "selective species eradication" with regard to predators. Predators are an integral and important part of any ecosystem. Removal of any part of an ecosystem will ultimately do damage to the whole system. The removal of wolves from Yellowstone is a classic example of failed NPS policy.

Correspondence ID: 12464 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 10:20:36

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: 12465 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please protect our wildlife and specifically the imperiled sea turtles! I urge you to find a positive solution other than off road vehicles within Caper Hatteras national Seashore! Especially with the horrific impact of BP's oil spill, now more than ever we NEED to protect our wildlife! PLEASE do your part toda!!!I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 12466 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:20:42
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: 12467 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:20:42
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: 12468 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:20:47
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: 12469 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:20:47
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: 12470 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Summers, David
Received: May,10,2010 10:21:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Following is an excerpt from a May 9, 2010 Virginian-Pilot news article by Catherine Kozak:
Numerous shorebirds in Cape Hatteras National Seashore are given higher levels of protection in a proposed off-road vehicle management plan than what the law ever intended the birds to have, a state wildlife official said.
State-listed "species of concern," - such as the American oystercatcher - do not require the extensive buffers and beach closures mandated for federally listed species such as the piping plover, said Gordon Myers, the executive director of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission.
Myers said that's beyond the intent of the state law: the state designation is supposed to be more of a call to action for a species.
The Wildlife Resource Commission, he said, will voice its objections to the use of state "species of concern" lists to trigger ORV management strategies under the federal Endangered Species Act.
That is of concern to us because it's apples and oranges," he said. "To treat it as synonymous with threatened and endangered is not congruent."
Thought this was interesting

Correspondence ID: 12471 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hughes, Stephen
Received: May,10,2010 10:21:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a resident of Maryland, I travel to the Outer Banks each spring and fall to surf fish, primarily in the areas of Buxton and Ocracoke. I consider the recreational sport of surf fishing, including Off Road Vehicle access to public beaches, an important part of our country's culture and heritage that must be preserved. I also recognize the need to protect our natural resources including endangered species that may be impacted by these activities.
After reading the Draft EIS, I was disappointed that there was not a more reasonable, middle-ground approach to maintaining public access while protecting natural resources and protected species.
My recommendations include: 1. Maintaining year-round, day and night access to key recreational areas such as The Point, Hatteras Inlet and Ocracoke South Point. 2. Designating key access corridors for pedestrians and vehicles that are available year round. 3. In other areas that do not have "key"

designations, implement temporary closures as necessary based upon nesting activities. 4. Allow for the relocation of sea turtle nests from any area to designated wildlife preservation areas that are restricted from pedestrian or vehicular traffic. 5. Limiting wildlife buffers to more reasonable limits (from 1,000 meters to 300 meters) around verified nests that are not within such distance from a designated full year access corridor.

Correspondence ID: 12472 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: jackson, keith j
Received: May,10,2010 10:25:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid fisherman and frequent visitor to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area I am in total disagreement with the DEIS that has been given to us. . . i might add with way to little time to really digest this monster... but thats another show... ALSO would really like to see the full name used when referring to this island in paradise... it was founded as a RECREATIONAL AREA for driving/fishing/camping/etc.. it was not intended to be used as a pawn in environmentalists attacks on a way of life
The buffers you are requiring for birds (1000 meters?) are really unfounded .. any data shown is bias and not really "true hard evidence"..
if anything Pea Island is all that is needed for birds/turtles and for that matter the dredge islands have more safer nesting areas than any other part of the islands.. an those birds are not counted..
how bout the birds on the roofs in nags head.. you gonna shut down those beaches.. the beaches in front of birders homes.. no. you wont.. nps is afraid of dow/autobon/selc....
also .. when are you planning of trying to make an effort in finding out who is destroying the roped off areas..or is it that you know who it is.. but not going to bother them??

Correspondence ID: 12473 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:26:14
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: 12474 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:26:15
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: 12475 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Davis, Clayton W
Received: May,10,2010 10:26:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live in the village of Avon, which is located in the middle of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I believe that closing our beaches is a classic example of bird-lover concerns gone mad. The closings will do the following things:
1. Destroy a cultural way of life that has been lived by generations of Hatteras Island residents.
2. Economically harm many residents who are already suffering under a severe recession. Children here are going to bed hungry. The lack of concern for the well being of good people is astounding, inexcusable, and infuriating.
3. Cause people to hate their government even more than they already do, and for perfectly understandable reasons.
4. Deprive thousands of visitors the harmless enjoyment of a Federal Recreational Area. This includes fishermen, windsurfers, surf boarders, shell collectors, swimmers, kite boarders, kayakers, and children playing in the sand at ocean's edge.
5. Kill an island to save a bird.

If you are going to shut down our beaches, you should also go shut down the beaches at Ocean City, Maryland and Atlantic City, New Jersey and all the others. We are being singled out and punished for no sound reason, only for the pleasure of the radical, extremist bird-lovers. Go pick on all the other beaches, too, and see what backlash you get.

The lack of consideration for the serious economic harm that is being done to us is criminal and needs to be fixed.

Correspondence ID: 12476 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Logan, S
Received: May,10,2010 10:27:10
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: 12477 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:27:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: please keep the beaches clean

Correspondence ID: 12478 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kramer, Teddy C
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Superintendent Murray: I am writing you today to make formal comments on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement, specifically Alternative F, created by the National Park Service with input from the negotiated rulemaking advisory committee. Before commenting on the contents of the document, we would like to call attention to the shocking exclusion of useful data to determine the potential economic impact of Alternative F. The DEIS suggests "F" will have revenue impacts on small businesses "at the low end of the estimated range rather than the high end." From our conversations with small business owners on Hatteras Island, any restriction in access will have severe economic impacts to their families, as the closures in the past years have. In an already disastrous economy, the actions taken by the Court and the Service have proved devastating to all businesses and residents on Hatteras Island. For anyone to claim differently would be either a misguided statement of ignorance or just a pure falsification of the truth. The last names of the original settlers of Hatteras Island can be found in the phonebook to this day. These families have been rooted in this community even before the founding of our nation. Today, their livelihoods are being threatened by that government. After consulting with the elected leaders of Dare County, we would like to comment on the four critical aspects of the DEIS, the first being the vitally important management tool of corridors. In the past during a closure, our offices were able to work with you and your staff to create corridors around resource closures. These alternative paths are indispensable to the continued movement of pedestrians and vehicles. Also, the corridors allow visitors to access an open area that may be sandwiched between two closed areas. These corridors have limited negative impacts to the protected species, but they are crucial to providing access during closure periods. We stand with Dare County in requesting that corridors be maintained for pedestrians and vehicles in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. When reviewing the management of any wildlife species by the state of North Carolina, anyone can see our management plans are based on reliable and reputable science and data. Political whims are not entered into the formula for the management of species by our State. We are concerned that political inclination is the reason for and basis of the management buffers within the DEIS. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions of an unfledged piping plover chick represents 771 acres of closed beach. This seems a bit arbitrary and capricious when managing a species. We have yet to read any scientific reasoning behind this management strategy. We would argue a buffer of 200 meters would be just as effective for the survival of a piping plover chick without the extreme penalization of the residents and visitors of Hatteras Island. Another confusing issue in the buffers listed in the DEIS is the equal and even more protective status given to species not on the endangered species list. Birds listed as North Carolina species of concern should not be given protected status under the Endangered Species Act. We have spoken with both the Chairman and Executive Director of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission regarding this matter. Both have informed us that these unnecessary protections were never the intent of the Commission's participation in this process, nor a requested outcome. They have also informed us that other species of concern are not given ESA status on other federal lands. Pre-nesting closures should be exclusively for the piping plover, the only federally listed threatened bird species. Also, non-ESA listed birds should not have buffers of 300 meters. The county feels a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. We also spoke with NCWRC regarding the inclusion of all birds in the ecosystem being counted when doing any type of management plan. Currently, birds on dredge spoil islands located adjacent to the Park are not being included in the population figures. They agree these islands have no predation and are ideal locations for nesting. To not include the populations of these islands is disingenuous to the intent of this process. The last technical portion of our comments centers on the treatment of the nests of endangered sea turtles within the Seashore. We would urge the Park Service to allow for the relocation of nests to higher beach elevations. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service practices this management tool in Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge, as do other management agencies on state and federal lands. The Seashore has lost over 46% of the nests laid in the last 11 years, while South Carolina relocated 40.1% of their nests during 2009, finishing the year with only a 7.7% loss of nests. To not allow for the relocation of nests puts both the users of the parks and the turtle hatchlings at competitive disadvantages. The key to any management plan is flexibility. Without the ability to change user patterns while keeping access open, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area will become but a memory to generations of users from across the globe. We would say that nowhere in our great nation can individuals enjoy the beauty and serenity of our coast as in the Seashore. For decades, families have been coming to Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands to utilize this area as President Roosevelt envisioned. As you move forward with your plan, you must remember the promises made by previous directors and superintendents and protect the access for residents and visitors alike.

Sincerely, Teddy Kramer

Correspondence ID:	12479	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Pearson, Randall I						
Received:	May,10,2010 10:29:17						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Sir or Madam. I am opposed to closure of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore for any reason other than Natural Disaster. My family has owned property in Salvo since 1961, I have spent most of my life enjoying the Beach and the Lifestyle of Hatteras Island. My first experience was living in a trailer where the Chicamicomico Fire Station is now. Joesph and Marylin Midgett had a Texaco Station on the Highway on the corner of RT 12 and the pier road. Times have changed and I agree to issues needing regulation. I am in support of a Licensing for vehicles using the beaches. I am in support of educating the users of of the seashore the need for co-existence with the wildlife and habiat of the Island as a requirement for beach driving. I see no need to list a bunch of excuses that have been already argued. My reason is purely personal. Regards Randall L Pearson						
Correspondence ID:	12480	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Erickson, Kathy						
Received:	May,10,2010 10:29:40						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	1) I disagree: Page 121. To completely prohibit pedestrian access in sections of the national seashore, runs completely contrary to the basis upon which the Park was founded, for recreation. 2) I disagree. I find the proposed 1000 meter buffers cited on pages 121 ? 127 unnecessarily restrictive and arbitrary. The use of such large buffers will cause people to be forced into smaller areas, with a subsequent greater impact on resource in the area. In addition, the expansion of the buffers as a punitive measure for infractions is also arbitrary. Please do not punish all for the offenses of one. 3) I disagree. The complete prohibition of ORVs, year round, pp 97-101, is entirely unnecessary, and will also impede human ability to partake of many recreational activities in the stated areas between ramps 27-30, Hatteras Spit, Ocracoke Inlet and others. 4) I disagree. Pets have been part of my, and continue to be part of many visitors' recreation and vacation experience. I disagree with the proposal to completely prohibit pets at the seashore beaches during "breeding season" from March 15th to July 31st. Page 136. Pets on a leash will not interfere with wildlife protection measures. 5) I disagree. It has not been proven scientifically that human interference is extensively responsible for damage to turtles and nesting birds, (less than 3%) so the prohibition against night driving for over half of the year is unnecessarily restrictive. P 104, P 377. No piping plover deaths have been attributable to ORVs. 6) Page 468, I disagree. Access should be provided through all species management areas. Buffers should move with the species, instead of being expanded.						
Correspondence ID:	12481	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 10:32:33						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, We have substantial space in this world for vehicles, even ORV. However, we do not have substantial space free of them. For the preservation of this simple luxury of a vehicle free space, the animals and environment, as well as the individuals who hope to enjoy this National Seashore please do not allow ORV use on these beaches! The freedom to be free of something is just as significant as the freedom to enjoy a thing.						
Correspondence ID:	12482	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Epperson, Bee						
Received:	May,10,2010 10:32:58						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I have been coming to Hatteras Island for the past 32 years, faithfully every year for a week, and many weekends throughout each year. Bypassing through Nags Head to enjoy the beaches filled with nature is the reason I choose to come to Hatteras year after year. In fact, I call it my "Home Away from Home". I believe that most people like myself, respect nature's activities. Roping off sections of the beach which have nests is fine and absolutely understandable, but to close the beach to vehicles is unfair. In any aspect of nature, there are always predators when there are nests or young ones involved. I sometimes think having the ORV's on the beach might actually divert some predators from bothering the nests and young. It would break my heart to see the beach closed to vehicles... I think we can live together with nature. Isn't that the beauty of Hatteras Island?						
Correspondence ID:	12483	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 10:33:27						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	As a property owner for over 25 years and some day permanent beach resident, I would like to comment on the on going debate concerning the closure of beach access. I love all wild life and there is nothing more relaxing than driving out to the beach and watching the birds, and occasionally we get a rare look at sea life. To fish or just to have the family together on the beach in the wonderful environment is a way of making memories that will last a lifetime. The actions of few should have made the law abiding beach goers pay for their total disregard for this wonderful strip of beach. Please reconsider your decision to close beach access.						
Correspondence ID:	12484	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 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 Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches, not to mention the animals that call it home. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. I cannot even imagine seeing ORV's at the beach--I think it would destroy everything people love about going to the beach, and would destroy animal habitat as well. Overall, I think this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and 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 one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of						

future generations."

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12485 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: herring, joseph

Received: May,10,2010 10:35:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I would like to as the park service to keep beach access open on cape hatteras national seashore it is okay to keep pea isalnd closed but from pea island south to the end of hatteras island I ask you not to close it I have been going there since I was born cape hatteras national sea shore is like my second home yes I don't live there never have but that is the only beach I go to when I am on vaction it is a second home for me. since the late 1980s and early 1990s you been closing parts of the beach now you want to take it all I do not understand this bird thing it is not endangered so why close it at all I speak for my self and most tourist we respect the wildlife and that bird we never would harm a animal now you tells we can't walk on the beach surf on the beach fish on the beach and we can't drive on to do this stuff this is a sad day I have surf fished there for more than 15 years now I watch my great uncal fish there and shark fish there too you are taking away my childhood and my children's child hood this is wrong it is unfair how do those town survive with out us coming down there? you might as well throw the locals off and at the bridge at Organ inlite say it is close for birds and the loghead sea turtle like I said I have no problem with pea island I love the loghead sea turtle and it is endangered but I have problem with this so called bird that is not endangered shame on you shame on the Audbond socity shame on congress this is a very important issue to me and everyone who loves hatteras and lives there too we don't want our beaches closed please open them back we will watch the birds and we will protect them and we will treat the beaches with respect just like we always have.

Joseph W. Herring

A Hatteras friend

Correspondence ID: 12486 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Uecker, Robert

Received: May,10,2010 10:36:24

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: 12487 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 10:36:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: While I support protection of endangered species and am concerned about the general well-being of the environment I am most concerned with the negative impacts that have already been/are yet to be realized by the natives and long-term residents of Hatteras Island. We are owners of a vacation home on this beautiful island and have made several recent trips there in preparation for rental season. It is sad to see the many businesses that have been forced to close as a result of the domino effects of this project. Many of these businesses have existed for generations. Even the few (restaurants) that typically remain open year-round are now closing during off-season in order to remain viable. At what point are human lives being considered above those of species whose habitats are being protected? Who will step up to the plate to ensure assistance to those who love Hatteras Island but can no longer afford to live or work there?

Correspondence ID: 12488 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Rau, Kevin

Received: May,10,2010 10:36:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have been visiting Hatteras Island since I was 10 years old. I remember my dad bringing me down to fish off the beach and have loved the island ever since. Now that I am 30, we bring my entire extended family down twice a year. Oddly enough I am employed by Phipps Conservatory in Pittsburgh, PA. Yes, the same Henry Phipps that gave the land to the NPS for the recreation use of the people is also the founder of my place of employment. Being a nature lover, Mr. Phipps wanted to educate and show the people how plants, animals and people could coexist with each other. The NPS is going against his wish by creating the DEIS. During our bi-annual visits, we would always set up a spot on the beach near the point. This has been a tradition that we've always look forward to as the snow falls in winter here in the north. Speaking from a tourist point of view, closing the beaches would greatly impact our decision to come to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. If our family is not able to access the beautiful beaches the island is famous for, there is no reason we should drive 10+ hours to sit at in our rental home for a week. My father and I attended the DEIS meeting in Buxton, NC on 4/26 and were very proud of the residents who had so many facts and reports to show that the recent closures of the past two years have not made a difference in the plover breeding success yet the NPS continues to penalize these residents to appease several special interest groups. I have been following this issue since the beginning and know it will crush the economy of the island if DEIS alternatives are passed. Based on personal experience,

I know my family's \$5,000-\$7,000 a year we spend on rentals, food, tackle shops and at restaurants will not return. As bad as I feel for the business owners, we can't justify the trip and expenses if we are not allowed on the beaches we come to enjoy. Many of the people who spoke at the meeting have lived on the island for generations and the economic impact of the Neg Reg has brought many of them to harder times than they've already been experiencing. Instituting further restrictions will only destroy the island economy more. It the hope of me and my family (as well as many other families) that the NPS realized the damage done over the past few years and begin to repair the relationships with the dedicated residents and scores of visitors by allowing beach access to all. The NPS is supposed to work for the people, not against them. With all the negative things happening in the world, Hatteras Island was our retreat, even if just for a week or two, to get away from it all and enjoy one of the most beautiful places in the world together. We can't imagine life without out it.

Correspondence ID: 12489 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Quigley, B
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
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. I was surprised to see all of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources, from my experience this is currently impossible.
3) I have seen first hand what ORV use does to a pristine environment, the degradation is horrific. From the several places I have seen, some in a beloved park near my home, it would appear there is a choice: either ORV use or an environment people can enjoy for quiet activities and where plant, aquatic and animal life is respected.
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.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12490 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Morris, Ron
Received: May,10,2010 10:40:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: After comparing the alternatives offered for the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I favor Alternative D - the environmentally preferred option - for the following reasons: 1) As noted by the Draft ORV Management Plan, this is alternative offers the greatest predictability. The issue of ORV use on CHNS has generated much controversy and conflict. Once a clear and relatively simple and straight-forward plan is adopted, most of the conflict will die down and all parties will move on. 2) Other alternatives include too many ambiguous measures that will result in further conflict. For example, Alternative F - the NPS favored alternative - states that "...circumstances could close that access corridor ...when shorebird breeding activity is observed..."(Table 10). ORV users and environmentalists are likely to have very different views at to what constitutes breeding activity that ought to result in the closure of an access corridor. Subjective measures such as these are likely to result in many more years of escalating hostilities between stake-holders. 3)Alternative D represents a simpler plan that will, consequently, be less costly to the NPS and taxpayers. This documents table estimates that Plan D will cost \$566,000 less per year than Alt F, the NPS favored option (see Table. 4)Alternative D still leaves 40% of all CHNS beach available for ORV use year-round (see page 114). 5)Finally, I favor Alternative D because it is the best option for protecting and sustaining vulnerable and threatened wildlife. Whenever human recreational interests come into conflict with the very survival of other species, we ought to choose the course that is least harmful to animal populations. The on-going tragedy in the Gulf of Mexico is a clear example of the harm that can result when the actions of humans go wrong.

Correspondence ID: 12491 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:40:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off Road Vehicles should be banned entirely from the Cape Hatteras Beaches area Forever. Period.

Correspondence ID: 12492 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Potts, Sienna M
Received: May,10,2010 10:42:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I live near the beach in California now & there is nothing like the peace of walking on a wide open beach. I've lived near the beach in Oregon too, where people are allowed to drive on the beach. It's not peaceful, it's scary. If that's going to keep me from the beach, what kind of damage is it going to do to the delicate ecosystem of the beach? Please leave our National Seashores to hikers & creatures, so that we may have a few wild spaces left to enjoy & to survive upon.

Correspondence ID: 12493 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Finley, Margaret E
Received: May,10,2010 10:42:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the proposed rule that requires a vehicle, used to transport a disabled person to the village beaches, be returned to the street. I disagree that everyone is called a visitor, I live here I am a resident of Hatteras Island. I am not a visitor. I disagree with the Park Service plan to introduce Sea Beach Amaranth into the park. Is there any proof that it was ever on Hatteras Island. If so when was the last verified sighting? I disagree with the size of the buffers for the plover and turtles. Option F is onerous,burdensome, oppressive, tyrannic and unjust.

Correspondence ID: 12494 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: moeller, robert c
Received: May,10,2010 10:43:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Keep the beaches as pristine as possible, keep vehicles off the beach!

Correspondence ID: 12495 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Stevenson, Luke
Received: May,10,2010 10:43:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family has traveled to the Outer Banks for over 10 years. We consider this our home away from home. And as fate would have it, my parents retired there. I hope that my children would one day experience the thrill of their Grandpa driving on the point for a picnic and fishing. Given, We do not come to the OBX to drive on the beach, but it is an integral part of our Island experience. Just this past November, my family and I were able to drive to 'our spot' along the coast (just north of Avon) and spent all day fishing and storytelling. We cleaned up after ourselves, as always, then headed back to civilization at sun down. That (to me)? is the Outer Bank. Not the light houses, not the wind sports, but getting away from it all and grounding yourself with family and nature.
I myself am a wildlife fan. I completely support wildlife preservation. My parents instilled this into my upbringing, as well as being a long time Boy Scout. However, I have become disappointed in the fact that the NPS seems too muscle out the people to support a somewhat-prospective preservation issue. I feel that there is some merit in your report, and the general scope is true. However I think the 'pork' of the findings and recommendations for beach access are extremely obtuse. You can't expect to restrict beach access to the people because the general findings of extreme preservationists feel that species, some that even are non-native, decided to show up. It is unethical, and frankly un-American.
I really hope that the committee will find a happy-medium between the preservationists, and the rest of us. I feel that the fate of the OBX depends on this decision. Please think of your childhood here. Please think of my family. Please think of the children. Please do not let this statement pass without major revisions.

Correspondence ID: 12496 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: taylor, stephen
Received: May,10,2010 10:44:09
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: 12497 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:46:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The proposed 1000 meter buffers cited on pages 121 ? 127 unnecessarily restrictive and arbitrary. The use of such large buffers will cause people to be forced into smaller areas, with a subsequent greater impact on resource in the area. In addition, the expansion of the buffers as a punitive measure for infractions is also arbitrary. Please do not punish all for the offenses of one. The complete prohibition of ORVs, year round, pp 97-101, is entirely unnecessary, and will also impede human ability to partake of many recreational activities in the stated areas between ramps 27-30, Hatteras Spit, Ocracoke Inlet and others.
Page 468, I disagree. Access should be provided through all species management areas. Buffers should move with the species, instead of being expanded.

Correspondence ID: 12498 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 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 have personally been to Cape Hatteras, and it literally took my breath. It is pristine and I believe meant to be left just as it is. It is meant for quiet and awe, a gift from God.

Sincerely,
Melanie Sanders

Correspondence ID: 12499 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:47:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with taking the beaches away from the tax paying public. We should all be able to enjoy the beach as well as nature. The beach is big enough for the birds, turtles and people to share. Florida is able to do this-North Carolina can too.

Correspondence ID: 12500 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:48:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Even though I personally cannot believe how many tourists actually bring their dogs on vacation to Hatteras Island, I do know that pets are big business nationwide. I do know that a huge proportion of rental homes on Hatteras Island as "Pet Houses" and for extra money allow pets to stay in the houses. If these vacationers cannot bring their dogs to the beach and walk them on leashes, I know that this will have a negative impact on the island economy, as much or more so than even the fishing industry.

Correspondence ID: 12501 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:49:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12502 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:49:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

Correspondence ID: 12503 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:49:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12504 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:49:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12505 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:49:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

Correspondence ID: 12506 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:49:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12507 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:49:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a supporter of national parks and do not like seeing them mismanaged for the pleasure of a few. 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.
Drivers of Off Road Vehicles can use private property for their recreational activities, they do not need to destroy the wildlands. Cape Hatteras is a special place and needs to remain so.

Correspondence ID: 12508 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:50:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a frequent visitor to Hatteras Island, I have been dismayed by the beach closures. Surely there must be a way to afford some protection to wildlife and to allow the public to continue to enjoy visiting these wonderful beaches.
Please consider a solution that preserves access to these beaches.

Correspondence ID: 12509 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:50:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The use of motorized vehicles in the park -- except for emergencies and fire -- is a totally unacceptable use of the area in question. Aside from being a nuisance due to noise and a hazard to those who walk the area, needless pollution due to oil and fuel leaks will result. The ability to carry in more food containers, and other disposables will add to the mess; from sad experience, I know these will not all be carried out, and the sheer amount will increase trash along the shore.
Also, destruction of dunes and other sensitive areas will be more prevalent; once in the more irresponsible riders will not be content with just "authorized" areas. They never are. And I know -- as do you -- that the park Service does not have the budget or manpower to effectively control such people. I wish it were otherwise; it is not.
Don't ruin this park, please!

Correspondence ID: 12510 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:51:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I was born and have live for all of my 56+ years in the state of North Carolina. I have always been respectful of our state's resources and wildlife. I have

also always been a recreational fisherman and particularly enjoy time on the outer banks. I find all of you draft alternatives to be excessively punitive to fisherman. Without ORV access I nor my children and newly born grandson can truly enjoy our state's great treasure. I support the proposal to manage ORV's on the seashore submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My recommendation is the NPS accept this alternative. Short of this I request you postpone a final decision on the ORV plan pending further review and honest/open negotiation on the counter points. Short of this alternative F with specific changes is my second recommendation. Specifically: 1) 1000 meters enclosures have no scientific justification. 200 meters is commonly acceptable. 2) Protecting non-endangered species, the American oyster catcher, equivalent to the piping plover is just plain wrong! 3) Turtle protection should favor the collection and captivity hatching. This is practiced in southern states with great success. 4) Providing reasonable access corridors is required to provide citizens beach access while protecting wildlife. 5) The total true impact to the coastal economy is not realistically represented in the DEIS and is huge. 6) Restricting pets on a 6 foot lease should be allowed. Threats by Derb Carter (stating in Raleigh that option D is the only legally defendable alternative) should not deter you from providing balanced access while protecting wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 12511 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Sample, Jackie
Received: May,10,2010 10:52:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is one of the greatest assets of our beautiful Outer Banks. It has been used and enjoyed by locals and visitors alike since its formation. Its value to our local economy is immense. Now it seems that the "rights" of a few birds and reptiles threatens to replace the rights of human beings to continue to enjoy access to this national treasure, even though humans and nature have managed to share this area very successfully for so long. It has been abundantly clear that the so called "environmentalist" have long had an agenda to close access to these areas - and now have a strong "foot in the door" towards this goal. There just seems to be no common sense applied to this issue in terms of beach closures, size of closures, extension of closures - but most importantly to the promises made back when the park was established that it would be an area always open to the public.
The saddest part of all is to think of my daughter who will only be able to look at the pictures of her grandfather, Ray Couch, catching puppy drum at the point and hearing stories about his fishing days with Aycock Brown on the beaches of the Seashore.....and very possibly never be able to experience the same type of access and freedoms that they treasured and lived for.
My family loves and respects nature and we also love and respect our beaches. I do not believe that one has to be to the exclusion of the other.

Correspondence ID: 12512 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Westervelt, Ernestine H
Received: May,10,2010 10:53:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a full time resident and small business owner on Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, I am writing in opposition to the dismissive, uninformed and unfeeling position taken in the DEIS on page 561, paragraph three, under "Assumptions, Methodology, and Impact Thresholds", on the effect of the proposed alternatives on the economy of the Outer Banks of North Carolina. Particularly distressing are the dismissive and unevaluated assumptions of the economic impact of the proposed alternatives on the individuals and businesses in the effected area, specifically Ocracoke Island and Hatteras Island.
May I ask how the writers of this DEIS proposal recommend or suggest that business on Ocracoke Island, reached only by boat or air, and acclaimed nationally and internationally for its beaches (in 2007 named the best beach in the entire country and the 5th best beach in the world by "Dr Beach"), "provide alternate products and services"?
Ocracoke is an island inhabited by about 800 people full time, supported mainly by various types of tourism based on small, locally owned and operated lodgings,restaurants, charter boats, ecology tours, tackle and gift shops and small scale commercial fishing. How can this economy, infrastructure and culture based on low key tourist traffic and fishing suddenly develop an industrial base, when the only way on and off the island for people and supplies is by a 40 minute ferry ride from the north, a 2 1/2 hour ferry ride from the west or private boat or plane?
The last sentence in this paragraph is as follows "If individuals visit other sites outside the Seashore, then these regions would experience an increase in business while businesses in the ROI would experience a decrease." My interpretation of this statement is that if the people of Ocracoke and Hatteras Islands lose their jobs, homes and businesses, become bankrupt and are forced to leave the islands, many with the graves of their ancestors who lived here as far back as the 1700's, it is okay with the environmentalists, federal bureaucrats, devoted protectors of wildlife and their lawyers as long as 0.52 piping plover fledglings a year have virtually unrestricted access to 12 miles of undeveloped beach and tourists spend their time and money elsewhere. Not only have visits by shellers, birders, fishermen and beach enthusiasts in general and their families decreased drastically with the current constant changes in beach openings and closings and have caused a loss of income to island residents and businesses, but business properties are now virtually unsaleable.
The title of the CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE AND RECREATIONAL AREA PROJECT was administratively shortened to "shorter title of "Cape Hatteras National Seashore" in all correspondence, except formal memoranda and documents which require the correct, full name- --" in a memorandum dated May 10, 1954.
This recreational area was established, maintained, cared for, respected, loved, supported and enjoyed thru hundred of years by caring, thoughtful visitors and dedicated residents who realized their livelihood and enjoyment of the way of life they loved depended on maintaining the beaches, animals, birds, sea life and marshes of this very special place. Environmental activists and their lawyers who have no real, actual physical involvement, "standing" or knowledge of this very special place should not be allowed to so drastically change lives and denigrate the area.
Unless the 6 proposed alternatives in the current DEIS are reevaluated to include an actual and comprehensive evaluation of the economic impact of the proposed drastic changes in the economic environment of the Outer Banks, with thought, concern and appropriate weight given to the human element with the lives and financial well being of the human residents given appropriate respect, I recommend only support and approval of Alternative A.

Correspondence ID: 12513 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Freeman, Tim J
Received: May,10,2010 10:53:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Sir: I have enjoyed the outer banks of North Carolina for many years, initially with my parents, with my 8 children and currently with my 24 grandchildren. In all those years, I have seen the care and concern of the local residents as well as the multitude of visitors for the environment. The respect for the wildlife has always been foremost in peoples minds. I was appalled at the actions taken by the National Park Service, acting at the behest of high price political lawyers, whose only concern were the fees from those with political ambitions. I have always been a very great supporter of the National Park Service,feeling that they are the most under rated, under funded,segment of the government. I am amazed at the reaction taken in the Cape Hatteras Seashore area.This action if allowed to continue will forever tarnish the image of the Service, as one who bows to the wills of the political few and the high price legal vultures. To destroy one of the most beautiful areas of the country, with invalid assessments,as well as the economy of an entire area would be unconscionable. I would respectfully ask that you stick to your long standing values of protecting the public areas and the wildlife therein without pandering to the will of persons or organizations with personal agendas. I must also say that I as well as others have lost all respect for the Audobon Society and will never contribute one cent to their endeavors. Believe me that sentiment is shared by multitudes. Thankyou for the opportunity to express my views.

Correspondence ID: 12514 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wolf, Darlene

Received: May,10,2010 10:53:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We used to spend every summer on the beach at Okracoke with our friends and family. There were no vehicles there and all was peace and quiet. Since then, I see that there are tremendous plowed up areas in the sand and noise which is intolerable. There is no reason to allow any vehicles on the sand at all. Not only does it disturb the citizens, but makes it impossible for the wildlife. Shame on whoever allowed this to start. I was so shocked and sad when I saw what had happened to our once beautiful seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12515 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Fillman, Don W
Received: May,10,2010 10:54:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please maintain ORV Access to Cape Hatterass National Seashore. I vacation in this area yearly, Surf Fish all areas esp, Cape Point. There can be a balanced access to address all parties. Beach Closures have affected this area in all ways, esp the small business owners who make thier living on the tourist trades. I endorse the use of Bull pens for Self Contained vehicles while not actively fishing on the front beach. This is a way of life, a way of vacationing and surf fisihng in this area that dates back decades. Thank you for your co-operation.

Correspondence ID: 12516 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a wonderful natural resource with beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement cater to ORV use. This approach fails to conserve the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area unique. I support the "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over Off Road Vehicles. All recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) Congress specifically designated Cape Hatteras as a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for 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 experience of primitive wilderness. It is essential that NPS allow ORV use only if it does not harm wilderness and wildlife.
3) The final Plan/EIS must 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 America's heritage for future generations. I hope to see an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12517 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:56:13
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: 12518 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:56:18
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: 12519 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:56:19
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: 12520 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: lickman, lisa
Received: May,10,2010 10:56:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a person who comes to the outer banks on vacation every year. I cannot tell you how much I love coming to this area. I have not read the document in question since I am not an expert in protecting wildlife. But as one of the people who uses the beach, I am one of the people who could contribute to the problems for the wildlife that you are attempting to protect. There has to be some balance between people and the wildlife since we are all entitled to utilize the resources and enjoy the beauty of this planet. I can tell you that the people who do frequent the beaches are extremely respectful of the rules that exist. We understand the need for them and abide by them at all times. If the beach was no longer convenient for us to use, we travelers would not come to the area. It seems to me that the wildlife and people currently coexist in this area very well. It would be better if the plan had some flexibility to it as suggested by the senators from North Carolina. Part of what attracts people to the area is the natural beauty that has been preserved by the Forest Service. So we are not looking for the rules to be less strict. Only that the rules allow both people and animals to coexist in peace.

Correspondence ID: 12521 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:56:30
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: 12522 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thanks for the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D - if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
Otherwise, the final plan should focus on:
- Providing Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
- Putting Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding,

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12523 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 10:56:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Sincerely,
A Concerned Citizen

Correspondence ID: 12524 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 10:56:49
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: 12525 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 10:56:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with not allowing pets on the beaches. If a pet is kept on a leash, then there will be no harm to the wildlife. There are no sidewalks in the Hatteras area so it would be dangerous to walk on the roads. It would be a shame to lose a human life when they are trying to walk their pet due to a car hitting them when they could have been safe on the beach.
As a visitor to the Outer Banks, the fact that dogs were allowed on the beach in Hatteras Island attracted us to the area. We used to vacation in Southern Shores where they are not allowed on the beaches, so we quit visiting there. (They do have sidewalks.) This would cause pet owners to not want to vacation in the area which would cause a burden economically to homeowners renting their homes, rental companies, restaurants, stores, etc.

Correspondence ID: 12526 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:01:03
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 Chad Rudow

Correspondence ID: 12527 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 11:01:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: More and more, wild and delicate spaces are being encroached upon by modern technologies that have no place in contributing to that area's sustainability. Please take steps to eliminate off road vehicles from Cape Hatteras National Seashore in an effort to show that your dedication to environmental sustainability is evident and effective. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 12528 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:02:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: May 10, 2010
Karen and John Hartrampf 58883 South Beach Drive Box 781 Hatteras, NC 27943
Mr. Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park drive Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray
We write to urge you to decide in favor of keeping all beaches included in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore CLOSED to driving if they are located within the villages or other residential areas. We are homeowners for the past 12 years here, and have first- hand experience with the dangers to life and limb that accompany beach driving where swimmers and other beachgoers are present.
Although beach driving is a long tradition here, it arose out of necessity because of the lack of paved roads until relatively recently. Hatteras Islanders have eagerly embraced other improvements such as the electric co-op and water service. Nor do they spurn Hwy 12 as their main transportation artery. Why do they then demand unfettered access to the beach for cars and trucks?
We, too, enjoy beach driving for surf fishing in safe, designated areas. But a visit to these spots will reveal the deep ruts that are unsightly, disruptive to wildlife, and impossible for all but the hardiest to walk in without difficulty.
Enough! We feel the NPS, in a laudable effort to be fair, has now expended too much of the taxpayers' money, and wasted 2 years in fruitless "Negotiated Rulemaking." Please rule responsibly in this matter, and preserve our Cape Hatteras National Seashore and its flora and fauna for the people.
Fervently for our Seashore,
John and Karen Hartrampf

Correspondence ID: 12529 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 11:02:39
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: 12530 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 11:03:11
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. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12531 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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, Brian Kimsey

Correspondence ID: 12532 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Conrad-Antoville, Kristin Anne
Received: May,10,2010 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, Kristin Anne Conrad-Antoville

Correspondence ID: 12533 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:19:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12534 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 11:19:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12535 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

It is very important to me for there to be more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and for less disturbance of wildlife, which I believe this alternative plan would provide.

Please see the following list of important concerns that need to be addressed in the final plan if the Alternative D act is not approved.:

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

* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan does NOT set aside adequate areas that are FREE of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are very few and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and objectives for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need to be upgraded on the basis of the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on the degree of support the Seashore shows presently. On the basis of annual reviews that indicate that birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

In my humble opinion, the National Parks do not exist only for human recreational activities but also for preservation of the wildlife and the habitat that supports it. If we do not actively protect an environment such as the National Seashore, how can we experience it, appreciate it, or treasure it?

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

Correspondence ID: 12536 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Smith, Greg

Received: May,10,2010 11:20:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To think that the National Park Service is even considering an expanded restriction of any kind for Beach Access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is setting a dangerous precedent in our time. Current conservation and environmental policies at the CHNS are completely adequate in safeguarding the habitat of all sea and shore birds and other wildlife inhabiting the beaches and connected areas.

Allowing so called environmental organizations to come in and dictate policy based on incorrect science is appalling. There is a current trend in the United States of so called environmental organizations filing law suits against various other businesses, industries and organizations in order to push their own agenda and force their ideals upon others. In almost all cases their so called facts are based upon bias and directed science, not scientific fact based on complete and documented research that includes all pertinent information available. They only wish the outcome as they see it, not as reality

exists.

I have had direct involvement with so called environmental organizations with which to base my opinions. I had spent 10 years volunteering with one such organization here in California. Their views are a good example of the whole of current "environmentalism" in the United States that forces ideals that have no basis of absolute fact. They wish to "save" something that is not in danger of being lost, in any way, which always has a damaging effect on certain businesses, industries and the economy overall.

I am all for conservation but is there a reason that we have to go overboard? I live and work at the beach. I've not seen any need for excessive conservation efforts because there has always been a good balance between humans and wildlife that coexist in those areas. People go to the beaches to be able to interact with nature, not destroy it.

The visitors and locals who use the Cape Hatteras National Seashore have shown that they have a healthy respect for the wildlife that inhabits the area. Why there has to be a change in policy based on nothing other than some organizations beliefs is beyond me.

Thank you, Greg Smith Los Osos California

Correspondence ID:	12537	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Altman, Jonathan						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:22:41						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Park Managers, Does this document take into account sea level rise and the break-up of the Outer Banks into multiple islands? Dr. Stan Riggs predicts multiple new inlet formation in the near future and the end of Highway 12 as the one transportation link. With new inlets there will be new habitat at new locations and these areas would need resource protection management. I do support pedestrain access, where appropriate and with disturbance buffers, along the shoreline in areas that are closed to vehicles for resource protection. I hope to take my daughter to the seashore as visitors and walk out to the point without tire ruts and vehicles, at certain times of the year. It doesn't have to be all access or no access (no vehicles and no pedestrains). Thank You.						
Correspondence ID:	12538	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	MARKS, IRA H						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:23:12						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	IT IS ABOUT TIME THAT OU NATURAL PLACES ARE GIVEN THE RESPECT THEY DESERVE						
Correspondence ID:	12539	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:23:57						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Off Road Vehicles are not going to help preserve this coastline. Please do not allow them.						
Correspondence ID:	12540	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:24:09						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Sirs, I would like to see my National Park left as it was before Audubon's lawsuit. Some changes were needed within the Park but access must always be provided to historic areas like Cape Point. We don't mind the seasonal enclosures when shoreline access is offered. Thank you, Kevin Mc Cabe						
Correspondence ID:	12541	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:26:07						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Gentlemen; The ORV Management plan at Cape Hatteras National Seashore needs to maximize access by the public and minimize restrictions as we have witnessed for the last few years. Thank You, Alonza Carlton, Sr.						
Correspondence ID:	12542	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:26:30						
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:	12543	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:26:30						

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: 12544 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,10,2010 11:26:36**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: 12545 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,10,2010 11:26:50**Correspondence Type:** Web Form**Correspondence:**

I discovered our Outer Banks as a child, but didn't really come to fully appreciate them until I became an adult. We have fewer and fewer unspoiled places such as this to relax, reflect, and enjoy the beauty of creation. I understand the need to preserve our natural resources, but what's the use if we're denied access to them? The Outer Banks aren't just a great place to fish - although that is definitely the case! They are a great place to connect with nature. The people I've encountered in the remote areas, such as Cape Point on Hatteras Island, love and respect the land. They do not destroy it, as seems to be the thinking of those trying to deny access to it. They drive where permitted, and leave the other areas undisturbed, and peacefully co-exist with the wildlife and foliage. What a shame it would be if the areas were no longer accessible - think of what the future generations would miss out on! It's hard enough to get our kids today to leave the video games and go outside - why take away one of the most wonderful, special places on earth in which they can learn and grow, experience nature at its best? Please don't let this happen! Find a happy medium by which we may still share in the beauty and awe of the Outer Banks!

Correspondence ID: 12546 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y**Name:** private**Received:** May,10,2010 11:26:59**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.

Sea turtles need this protection. With the oil spill in the Gulf threatening them so much more, this management of ORV in the Cape Hatteras would be very beneficial to the turtles and the other wildlife in the area.

Correspondence ID:	12547	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:28:01						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12548	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:28:25						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Cape Hatteras is too fragile and too beautiful an area to let off road vehicles destroy. Leave it as it is for the wildlife to inhabit and for visitors to enjoy.						
Correspondence ID:	12549	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:28:37						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	As there are already so many beaches off limits to people now, there should be some left open for humans. For example, Pea island, Core Banks, Portsmouth Island, and False Cape in Virginia. NC will suffer as far as tourism and fishing if everything is closed to vehicles. Most people are respectful of wildlife. Don't punish all for a few.						
Correspondence ID:	12550	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	Little, Susan J						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:29:41						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I love the Outer Banks and have spent yearly vacations there since the mid-70s when my husband was in the Coast Guard at Virginia Beach, VA. I have been in an ORV on the national seashore when it is allowed. I have seen what the beach looks like after many vehicles have been on the beach. There needs to be some access for the fishermen but not more access. Please continue the limit of ORV usage on the national seashore. Hurricanes are hard enough on this beautiful area. We don't need the dunes and beaches destroyed by ORV traffic.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12551	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:29:44						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Written Public Comment Addendum, 5/10/2010 Submitted by Alan Pitt To whom it may concern:</p> <p>In light of recent revelations concerning NC "Species of Special Concern" shorebird species, specifically American Oystercatchers, (AMOY), Least Terns, (LETE), and the ESA threatened Piping Plover, I wish to make an additional comment beyond my original dated 5/7/2010.</p> <p>Pursuant to the following newspaper article: http://hamptonroads.com/2010/05/orv-plan-gives-too-much-space-some-species-critics-argue Excerpts in relation to AMOY et al protection distances are discussed by NCWRC Executive Director Gordon Myers, as published in the "Virginia-Pilot" online newspaper, authored by Catherine Kozak,(cate.kozak@pilotonline.com), (Referenced link above) "State-listed "species of concern," - such as the American oystercatcher - do not require the extensive buffers and beach closures mandated for federally listed species such as the piping plover, said Gordon Myers, the executive director of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission. Myers said that's beyond the intent of the state law; the state designation is supposed to be more of a call to action for a species. The Wildlife Resource Commission, he said, will voice its objections to the use of state "species of concern" lists to trigger ORV management strategies under the federal Endangered Species Act. "That is of concern to us because it's apples and oranges," he said. "To treat it as synonymous with threatened and endangered is not congruent." " Given this information, along with the stance of the NCWRC in relation to AMOY buffer distances, I respectfully request that the AMOY buffers are reduced or eliminated outright, along with any other NC listed "Special Concern" species such as Least Terns. (LETE) Continued: " "In a letter about the 810- page draft plan sent to park Superintendent Mike Murray on Tuesday, state Sen. Pro Tempore Marc Basnight of Manteo and state Rep. Timothy Spear of Creswell also questioned the 1,000-meter buffers required in all directions around an unfledged piping plover chick. " "We have yet to read any scientific reasoning behind this management strategy," the legislators wrote, adding that a more reasonable buffer would be 200 meters." " I agree with and support the recommendations set forth by Sen. Pro Tempore Basnight and NC US Rep. Spear, that the 1K meter buffers for PIPL be reconsidered at 200 meters.</p>						

Continued:

""Basnigh and Spear support Dare County's request to establish corridors around closures so public access to open beaches can be maintained, and to decrease buffers for non threatened species from 300 meters to 30 meters.

Resources commission director Myers said the Park Service has always looked at numerous factors in determining its resource protection needs, including state lists. But until the draft plan stated - on page 419 - that the agency was managing state-listed species similarly to federally listed species, its policy had never been in black and white, he said." "

I agree with and support the recommendations set forth by Sen. Pro Tempore Basnigh and NC US Rep. Spear, that the 300 meter buffers be reconsidered at 230 meters for any and all NC Species of Special Concern.

In addition, the recommendations within the AMOY section of the DEIS in Chapter 2, Page 136, Table 13, Alt F that states "Prohibition of pets within the seashore during breeding season including in front of the villages, and establishment of breeding and non-breeding SMA's would benefit the AMOY". Due to revelations per the NCWRC recommendations, I respectfully ask that the AMOY pet recommendations be thoroughly and completely removed from the FEIS and final ORV ruling.

Also, a reference to PIPL on DEIS Page 66 of Chapter 2 reads "Pets should be leashed and under control of their owners at all times from March 15 to July 31 on beaches where PIPL are present or have traditionally nested. Pet's should be prohibited on these beaches from April 1 to August 31 if, based on observations and experience, pet owners fail to keep the pets leashed and under control"

Again, due to revelations pre the NCWRC recommendations, I respectfully ask that these PIPL pet recommendations be thoroughly and completely removed from the FEIS and final ORV ruling.

Please see to it that our extended family members, IE our pets, are not unfairly excluded from our national seashore.

Alan Pitt Richmond, VA/Frisco, NC

Correspondence ID: 12552 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:33:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:
Pea Island is a National Wildlife Preserve already established since 1938 for the preservation of wildlife. The seashores of Hatteras Island were put aside for public recreation.
The American people do not want these seashores taken away from their families. If this continues, we will find ways to get your people out of office and restore order. This is another example of the misuse of power in our government. It is not your right to take these seashores from the people of America.
As civilized and educated people, we can find ways to share the seashore with the animals that inhabit it.
Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 12553 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: rohrig, eric a
Received: May,10,2010 11:36:31
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: 12554 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:45:18
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: 12555 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lawson, Donna J
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: May 8, 2010
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray:
We are writing with regard to the proposed Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement, Alternative F. After lengthy and careful review of the above referenced document, related documentation, scientific data and discussion with residents and business owners, we have come to the conclusion that the DEIS, Alternative F, as proposed is flawed and lacks the balance necessary to maintain harmony between the wildlife we seek to protect and the rights of the residents, visitors and business owners of the region.
First, we have serious concerns as to the scientific basis for the sprawling piping plover buffer zones proposed in Alternative F. In that regard, we must support the Coalition for Beach Access' and Dare County's positions on this matter. To require a buffer zone of 1000 meters is unnecessary and scientifically unfounded. A more reasonable, scientifically supported buffer zone would allow the species to thrive and still allow visitors and residents access to enjoy the beach and support the local economy. We would request that relocation efforts be allowed for endangered sea turtle nests as well, especially in light of the fact that nests can and have been successfully relocated in other states resulting in minimal loss. There are more reasonable buffer zones and relocation alternatives to consider which result in a much more balanced proposal.
Second, Off- Road Vehicle access has been the cornerstone of this beach's visiting public and the backbone of the local economy. Severely limiting ORV access denies the citizens of this country the right to the enjoyment of all this serene and beautiful beach has to offer. ORV access is the reason this beach doesn't have huge ugly parking lots, numerous man-made walkways and bathroom/snack facilities. Visitors pack what they need in their vehicles, they fish, swim, sport, shell, bird and enjoy this beautiful beach and then they pack up and leave only tire tracks which are washed away by the tide, leaving the beach again untouched, clean and breathtaking in its beauty . We have been visiting this area for many years, spending two weeks at a time during various seasons and each time, we are struck by the harmony that has been achieved between the management of the park, the visitors and the wildlife. The current management plans have effectively and fairly handled ORV access issues with informed decisions, respect for the wildlife we come here to observe and the flexibility they need to maintain balance. To remove ORV access and management's flexibility to change user patterns and implement corridors to maintain access will effectively close this beach and eventually destroy the local economy while slowly crumbling the rich culture that these barrier islands hold.
Third, after speaking with residents, business owners and reviewing the numerous affidavits attached to Dare County's Position Statement, we find it incomprehensible that Alternative F can claim that the projected economic result of its proposal is "negligible to moderate". Businesses began failing in direct correlation to the issuance of the District Court's Consent Decree, NOT when the nation's economy began to falter. Affidavit after affidavit testifies to the fact that customers and visitors have been angered by the beach closings and have indicated they will not be back if they can't use the beach.
In summary, we would urge the National Park Service to reconsider its proposed restrictive covenants and keep in mind the original intent and promises made to the people of this region when this park was first established by Congress in 1937. A balance can be achieved without destroying an entire region's livelihood. We all want the wildlife to flourish as well as preserve the people's right to enjoy this unique seashore experience. Let's leave our tire tracks like we've been doing for decades and come back another day to a breathtaking sunrise.
Sincerely,
Dave and Donna Lawson Boyette House Condominiums 45 Ocean Road, Unit B, Ocracoke Island P.O. Box 239 Marydel DE 19964 302-670-4461
djuhrden@wildblue.net

Correspondence ID: 12556 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:49:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: National park Service:
Please don't close the Hatteras Beaches. Closing the beaches will have a devastating effect on the tourism industry of the Outer Banks, NC. Outer Banks hotels, restaurants, tackle shops, charter boats, gas stations, grocery stores, etc. all rely on the tourism industry. If the beaches are closed, all of these industries will suffer.
I come down to Hatteras 10+ times a year. I spend money at NC hotels, restaurants, tackle shops, gas stations, and grocery stores. If you close the beaches, I will not come back. I am sure that a lot of other folks feel the same way.
Sincerely,
Brian Sechrist

Correspondence ID: 12557 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:49:40
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: 12558 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:49:40
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.
Thanks for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will follow this issue and hope for a more balanced final plan for all visitors and wildlife alike.

Correspondence ID: 12559 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:49:40
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: 12560 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:49:40
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:	12561	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:49:40						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please do not approve the Off Road Vehicle (ORV) management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore that will disproportionately dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors.						
Correspondence ID:	12562	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:49:46						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.</p> <p>This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12563	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:49:46						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.</p> <p>This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12564	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 11:49:46						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.</p> <p>In light of the heartbreaking Gulf oil spill disaster, we need to make every effort to protect remaining coasts for people and wildlife alike.</p> <p>This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan 						

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12565 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:50:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off road vehicles have no place on fragile expanses of beach such as Cape Hatteras. They disturb the wildlife and the peace of those who like to walk in solitude with only the sound of the surf. These vehicles are unbelievably destructive and should be confined to places where those who want to enjoy silence or quiet conversation and beautiful scenery don't come. Thank you for your attention to this very important matter.

Correspondence ID: 12566 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Butler, William A
Received: May,10,2010 11:52:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As one who visits the Outer Banks for birds and solitude, as well as summer swimming, I urge you to minimize beach ORV use. There is no reason to allow joy riding which can take place many other places at the expense of other beach users, both human and animal/bird. Fishermen can walk like the rest of us, and really want their cars for beer and boomboxes. (The best fishing is in mid-autumn anyway.) At the very least, they should be severely curtailed during the bird and sea turtle nesting season. These people do far more damage than their relatively small numbers would suggest, and seem to have more political weight than their numbers warrant. Extensive ORV use has no place on a National Seashore, and if allowed at all, should be greatly limited in space and season of the year. You don't have the personnel to police when and where they go, so it is best simply to prohibit them. ORV users have no respect for other beach users who try politely to explain when they are out of bounds and creating habitat damage.

Correspondence ID: 12567 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Carmichael, Victor
Received: May,10,2010 11:52:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off-road vehicles have no place on the beach except in emergencies.

Correspondence ID: 12568 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:53:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Don't let your beaches get ruined with off road vehicles. I have been there and that would be a shame!

Correspondence ID: 12569 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:53:07
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: 12570 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 11:54:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a resident of Virginia who vacations at Nags Head and Ocracoke several times a year with my family. I believe the Dare County DEIS Position Statement is preferable to the National Park Service's Preferred Alternative (F).
I have been coming to the Outer Banks for 30 years, and part of our experience is driving on the beach and fishing, which we have always done responsibly.
Please accept the Dare County guidelines or at least postpone making a permanent decision without further study.
Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12571 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Blaisdell, jill
Received: May,10,2010 11:54:34

Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>I am a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.</p> <p>The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches.</p> <p>All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement, privilege ORV use over all 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 the ORV management plan places greater emphasis on pedestrian access and wildlife management, especially with regard to endangered sea turtles and shorebirds.</p> <p>sincerely, Mrs. Blaisdell</p>				
Correspondence ID:	12572	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	private				
Received:	May,10,2010 11:55:26				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>I'm sorry, but I received this information too late to thoroughly review the DEIS. However, I think it is imperative that we do as much as possible to keep these nesting/breeding grounds from being overrun by ATV's and other unnecessary human disturbances. While, it is not necessary for people to operate ATV's on the beaches, it is necessary for the birds and turtles to nest there in order to perpetuate their species. Personally, I would rather the ATVs go extinct than the birds and turtles. As an individual who enjoys listening and watching wildlife, I abhor the intrusion of noisy machinery tearing up the beaches. These ecosystems are too delicate to sustain that kind of abuse, and it is destroyed for the rest of us who appreciate it, as well as the wildlife who depend upon it. They need to take their ATV's elsewhere and, if they can't find another place to wreak havoc, good.</p>				
Correspondence ID:	12573	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	private				
Received:	May,10,2010 11:56:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>We need to take another look at off-shore drilling.....Do we have the necessary safeguards to continue this practice? The danger to the Louisiana coast if of major proportions. The idea that it could spread to East coast is overwhelming.</p>				
Correspondence ID:	12574	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Ehrhardt, Carole				
Received:	May,10,2010 11:56:23				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>I am a private citizen and not a member of any special group. However, I have learned that the NPS may open up the area in Cape Hatteras to off road vehicles. This area has delicate areas which will not tolerate ORV use as these vehicles tear up this fragile environment. Too much of our USA seems to be used by people who have no concept of their actions, using ORVs to destruct pristine areas and more.</p> <p>Please do not allow this in the Cape Hatteras area. The National Park Service should help keep our parks available for those who want to appreciate them for their natural beauty, not to just rush through them for a short term thrill, and at the same time, destroying why they are set aside for the Parks. Thank you.</p>				
Correspondence ID:	12575	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	private				
Received:	May,10,2010 11:56:30				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>Cape Hatteras National Seashore is one the most beautiful seashores in the country and one of our favorite places to visit. Ecologically it also is very fragile and I hate to think what effect increasing off-road vehicle traffic will result. Certinly it will not improve it--it can only degrade it.</p> <p>I urge you not to cave-in to political pressure and/or lobbyists but to do the right thing by not allowing any increases and even strongly consider reducing usage.</p> <p>Thank you, Philip Chappel Leesburg, FL</p>				
Correspondence ID:	12576	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	private				
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.</p> <p>The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:</p> <p>Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.</p> <p>Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.</p> <p>Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. It is just dismal how many sea turtles have died and are suffering unspeakably due to the continued pumping of 5,000 gallons of oil since April 15, into the gulf off the coast of Louisiana. Please help these majestic, magnificent creatures find a safe haven at your beautiful Cape Hatteras with safer, more protective guidelines prohibiting ORVS. Thank you. Judy Stobbe</p>				
Correspondence ID:	12577	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:					
Received:					
Correspondence Type:					
Correspondence:					

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:56:48
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: 12578 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:56:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access, which was identified in the DEIS as the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principals should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 Provide Equal Access for All Visitors: Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 Put Natural Resources First: Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery: A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

Correspondence ID: 12579 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 11:58:56
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: 12580 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: If the Federal Government is so worried about protecting wildlife, you might try stopping all off shore drilling. One oil spill will destroy more wildlife than ten years of running over the nesting grounds with vehicular traffic. You all need to get your priorities straight. I would think this last episode with BP's oil well in the gulf would be sufficient enough for the govt. to halt production of any additional wells. I understand Virginia is trying to get new drillings passed off shore of their coast. I believe the fishermen and most of the recreational users of the Outer Banks Beaches deserve to use the shoreline as it has been used for generations. I feel your temporary closures and roping off areas are more than sufficient to protect the wildlife. Some of

these species are far from endangered and I sincerely believe the Govt. is hyping that up a bit to much. The Plover in question is very prevalent in other parts of the county. Texas has an abundance of them. They may be scarce in N.C., but they are far from endangered. Use some common sense and not just listen to the one sided versions by the various wildlife groups. You will destroy the fragile economy of the Outer Banks if you pass these restrictions. You might as well close down all the tourist traffic from the hotels at Nags Head from going swimming on the beach. Same principles apply to the wildlife on those beaches. Close it all and see how fast the tax dollars shut down going to the state and government coffers.

Correspondence ID:	12581	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 12:01:18						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I'm concerned about this plan because I understand that the area is a major sea turtle habitat. Baby turtles have difficulty navigating tire tracks on their (already somewhat treacherous) journey to the safety of the water. I'm also concerned that female turtles will be frightened of the bright lights and loud noises and will not nest properly. Please also consider people who would like to visit the beach (especially with small children) to enjoy the peace and quiet offered by wilderness. Almost everywhere else we go is saturated with vehicle noise - please keep this place the serene place it has always been.						
Correspondence ID:	12582	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.</p> <p>2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.</p> <p>3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.</p> <p>4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors." However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)</p> <p>5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.</p> <p>6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.</p> <p>7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.</p> <p>8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.</p> <p>9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%, So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.</p> <p>10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.</p> <p>11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues. As a resident of Hatteras Island, we of the Hatteras Island community have always gotten together on the south beach on weekends to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, tanning, games, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer</p>						

which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fishermen want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs. 15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Correspondence ID: 12583 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 12:08:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Me and my family have visited Hatteras Island for some 20 years. We fell in love with the island and its culture so much that seven years ago we decided to buy a future retirement property on the island. We are deeply concerned that the recent action, initiated by a non-resident, special interest lobby group will change, for the negative, not only the island's culture but may totally destroy its economy as well.

While we are not great fishermen, we do like to fish occasionally and appreciate and respect others whose sole passion is fishing.

While we have a four wheel drive vehicle, we do not consistently drive up and down on the beach - but when we do, we love the freedom to do so.

While we do not have a dog, we do understand (as long as they are controlled) that others like to have their pets with them on the beach.

We are greatly disturbed that the proposed legislation would severely restrict or even in some cases totally eliminate these activities in certain areas and/or in certain places, needlessly.

0012207

We are aware of the need to protect wildlife - particularly if it is endangered, but not at any cost, when other more logical methods can be found. We also strongly disagree that anyone has the right to kill one species of wildlife to protect another.

Some parts of Hatteras Island are inhabited and have been inhabited for many years by humans. Some parts, like Pea Island are not. In addition, the wilderness has reclaimed islands such as Portsmouth and most of Ocracoke Island. While there is no question that it is possible to totally turn Hatteras Island into a wilderness - the question is why and at what cost. This is what we believe that this 810 page document does not address adequately.

This whole legislative action was spawned by a legal action by an external, special interest lobby group suing the National Park Service. If this legislation does go through, and it will damage the island's culture and economy - who will pay for the cost of future litigation and damages against the NPS? Since the NPS is a government agency - I do not want the double jeopardy of being both damaged by the legislation and having to pay for its defense. Furthermore who will pay for the cost of the enforcement - which judging from the last few years has been unconscionable, given what little result they have achieved and that is not counting the economic damages that the temporary legislation has already caused.

Here are some suggestions that I believe do make sense;

1. Get an agreement that is legally binding that will ensure that the Audubon Society will pay for all litigation and damages that may come as a result of this legislation. I am sure that they will not agree. Therefore the NPS in drafting this legislation should listen to the residents and the people that this legislation will directly and indirectly affect, and not to some external special interest lobby group.
2. Get the Audubon Society to pay for the cost of enforcement for any legislation - if they won't, then there can be no enforcement unless the residents, who pay the taxes agree.
3. More practical is moving the few endangered animals to areas where they are not in human contact - this has and is being done right now. There is plenty of room.

Correspondence ID: 12584 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:09:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendant Murray,

I introduced myself to you at the Lost Colony Chamber function on Friday. I apologized to you for some of the rude and emotional behavior displayed recently by a few Hatteras Island residents even though I do admire their passion.

I just read Stewart Couch's comments and I appreciate his efforts and agree with his thoughts and comments on this crucial matter. I have not put in the time that he and others like Sam Hagedon (he was with me on Friday) have by attending all the Negotiated Rulemaking Meetings, etc. So in a way I feel like I am riding on coat tails here, but nevertheless, I am a law abiding, tax paying citizen who works every day and enjoys each moment spent on Hatteras Island.

Here is my simple thought and only comment: You have heard it all, from all sides. I am trusting you to do the right thing. I believe you to be an honest man with no hidden agenda. If I am correct, you will find a way to return peace and harmony to our community (and their guests), who have lived in harmony with nature for a long, long time. That is the right thing to do and I believe you know that.

Thank you, Dottie Reed

Correspondence ID: 12585 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gillette, Cynthia H
Received: May,10,2010 12:14:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

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

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

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

Thanks for your time,
Cynthia Gillette

Correspondence ID: 12586 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:18:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been visiting the Outer Banks for the past 45 years, first with my parents, now with my own family, and friends. You must find a way to protect, not prohibit access to the beaches, for all who love, work, live and visit these beaches. One of the greatest walking beaches on the east coast of the Americas is from the Cape Hatteras Lighthouse to the Point. Keep the beaches open for the people and let the people will protect them!!!

Correspondence ID: 12587 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

- 1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
- 2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet

of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

As a resident of Hatteras Island, we of the Hatteras Island community have always gotten together on the south beach to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, sun bathing, games, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the

Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs. 15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you

Correspondence ID: 12588 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 12:19:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep this invasion to a minimum.

Correspondence ID: 12589 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:19:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
I DISAGREE with the entire proposed plan to manage ORV usage on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Cape Hatteras community relies on tourism to support and maintain its economy. Given the current state of our nation's economy, fewer and fewer citizens are taking vacations. For the people that do decide to vacation at Cape Hatteras, they will currently find the number of beaches to enjoy very limited thus potentially turning them away for good. I frequent the area and was most recently there at the end of April, and I must admit, I was very disappointed with the number of beaches I could visit. Closing the beaches, as outlined in the proposed plan, will hurt an economy that is already hurting. DO NOT CLOSE THE BEACHES...the local economy depends on it!
Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 12590 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:19:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12591 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

As you may have realized, this message is generated from the Audubon Society web site, and as a concerned citizen, I am answering their call to comment. However, please know I am speaking foremost as a long time lover and frequenter of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

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

The Hatteras seashore is a "national" treasure and you must do whatever you can to protect its silence and space and wild nature. I realize the parks are multi-use, but as stewards of the earth we are the ones who make decisions about which animals survive and thrive and which do not, which spaces are full of quiet and calm and which are full of noise and activity, and which areas focus on the non-human world and which focus on us.

Your department will have the final say in all of this. You must choose wisely and you must choose the option that best preserves the essential nature of the Hatteras Seashore. One stroll down those wonderful beaches would teach you it is a place both of contemplation and brute natural force. Either one is harmed by too much intrusion from men and machines.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12592 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:20:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would urge the National Park Service to carefully consider the impact of closing beaches for the sake of migratory birds. While these birds need space, the coast is expansive and it is equally important to maintain pedestrian access to the coast.

Correspondence ID: 12593 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:20:10
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: 12594 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Righter, Susan H
Received: May,10,2010 12:25:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As a resident of Buxton, NC I am begging you to reconsider all of the restrictions you are proposing to put into place in the National Parks on our Outer Beaches. The restrictions are going to take away from the people the very heart of what we all live for down here. We love the birds & turtles, the woods and the beaches, the Ocean & the Sound with all our hearts. They make my soul breathe. Each day as I walk on the beach I feel refreshed and renewed. I always pick up litter that has washed up on to our beaches over the night. I enjoy watching the birds feed and I have done hours of volunteer work helping with the nesting turtles. Many of the residents have taken great pride in our beaches and have done hours of volunteer work at the light house, teaching tourists to fish, trail walks, bird club (I personally took many tourists in my own car to view the birds with the bird club), litter pick up, You name it we've done it. There has become a great divide between the Park Service and the people over the past 3 years because of what the people feel is a threatening behavior (guns on the beach!) and unreasonable restrictions with little to no respect for the people. No matter where you go in this world there is always a fool or two who act irresponsibly and treat others and the land with disrespect but the very large majority don't. I personally always stop people from parking or kiting in the wrong place, drive too fast on the beach or are leaving trash behind. We all know there are not enough of you to keep an eye on everyone all the time so we try to help out as responsible citizens who love this area. When you become so unreasonable about making new restrictions and passing laws you loose all of that wonderful citizen support and help! We love here because we don't want to live in a police state. We have managed for many years to keep the beauty of our simple life. Please do not take that away from us!!! Many, many of the residents who live here will lose their ability to make a living down here and be simply able to survive. We aren't talking about extravagant people or life styles but hard working , patriotic, law abiding families who love God and their country. These people will lose everything when their businesses dry up and their property values plummet. How can you even coudsider doing what you propose and still sleep at night? There are reasonable and lawfull ways to protect us and the birds and turtles --- You know it and I know it! Most sincerely, Susan Righter

Correspondence ID: 12595 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:26:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments regarding the DEIS statement for management of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore are as follows and are being provided by a NC state resident and a visitor of Cape Hatteras National Seashore for close to 30 years.
None of the alternatives listed in the DEIS make any sense to me due to the fact that Cape Hatteras is a National Recreational Seashore. The research I have done regarding the creation of Cape Hatteras suggests that the only reason it exists as a park today is to be a recreational resource for the people of the United States. The proposed alternatives give very little regard to the recreational aspects of the seashore. I find this incredibly irresponsible of the NPS to provide a group of plans that do not suit the very nature of the parks existence.
It is my understanding that the proposed alternatives came from a negotiated rulemaking organization that met many times to try to reach an agreement on park management but failed to do so. I also know that it was of great importance to the group that they be able to negotiate in good faith outside the restricted confines of a courtroom. Yet the first thing several environmental groups did was to file suit against the NPS asking for additional protective measures. This, in my opinion tainted the entire process and put recreational advocates at a severe disadvantage. Therefore it comes as no surprise to me to see that many of the proposed alternatives in the DEIS favor the views of environmental organizations. I was highly disturbed to learn that the NPS did absolutely nothing to the environmental groups following their lawsuit even though it was in direct violation of the agreements made by all parties at the start of negotiated rulemaking. The fact that tax money ultimately paid for the plaintiffs legal bills is upsetting to the highest degree possible.
Off Road vehicles have been used as a traditional means of access to many areas of the seashore since the creation of motorized vehicles and beach travel has long been an established norm at Cape Hatteras. Taking this away will severely impact those that have grown to use this form of recreation on the beach. Wildlife, pedestrians and vehicles have coexisted for decades at Cape Hatteras and to date, I have not been able to find any science that suggests beach driving or walking on the beach has any impact on wildlife. Though many special interests groups will argue the opposite, they are simply arguing, they have proven nothing.
I am all for a plan that provides all seashore users with access to the beach. Not all users want ORV access so I completely agree that areas in front of the towns can, and for safety reasons, should be closed, at least seasonally, to ORV traffic. Other areas that have traditionally been used as ORV access areas for fishing and other beach uses should be opened unconditionally. Those areas should include Oregon Inlet, Cape Point, Hatteras Inlet and Ocracoke Inlet. The areas of beach that have established ramp access and are not in front of established villages should remain open. Areas used by surfers, wind surfers, and kite boarders should also remain open unconditionally. I would completely support pedestrian corridors, or even vehicle access corridors in areas where pedestrian and vehicle use might jeopardize safety. Bird nesting areas that are currently in effect are far too broad and should be resized. The latest data provided by NPS show the beneficial results of the Consent Decree closures to be negligible at best. It is obvious that large closure buffers are not the answer and that another approach is in order. Traditional bird nesting areas near cape point have become flooded due to NPS management mistakes and should be returned to a more natural state which is what wildlife prefers anyway. There are far too many alternative strategies to increasing wildlife nesting opportunities. To point to limiting off road vehicle traffic as the only means of increasing bird nesting is very irresponsible. Furthermore, most if not all shore bird deaths are directly caused by storms or predation by local wildlife. ORV or pedestrian closures cannot prevent this from happening.
In summary, please understand that my comments in general favor recreational access for all varieties of recreational needs throughout the park, with reasonable protections for wildlife where needed and when needed. Recreational users have always coexisted with wildlife in the park, past management strategies have worked well. Consent Decree strategies have been far too restrictive and have provided no real benefit.
Thank you Eric T. Blanks

Correspondence ID: 12596 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:26:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Cape Hatteras Seashore was established for public recreation and should be kept that way. There are several natural and spoil islands and Pea Island for the birds to nest undisturbed.
Free and open access was what was promised and should be honored.
Thank You for the oppotunity to comment.
Bob Kirkpatrick

Correspondence ID: 12597 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:27:41
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: 12598 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: HarrisI, Carolyn B
Received: May,10,2010 12:28:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree With the closing of the beaches for the piping plover and the oyster catchers. Also, I disagree with the prohibiting of pedestrian access from March 15-July 31 in 8 different beach locations. The economy of this island is based on tourism and if you close the beaches the tourist will not come here.

Correspondence ID: 12599 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cole, Richard B
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. My wife and I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations.
 I am a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and 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. As did my father before me, I find the Seashore to be a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. It seems that all of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, 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 recognize that conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife should take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs). Any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) The intent of Congress in establishing Cape Hatteras clearly was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use ("Except for 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 NPS needs to protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and should allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, , to achieve wildlife species recovery goals in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis.
 We look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
 Mr. & Mrs. R. B. Cole

Correspondence ID: 12600 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Covington, Joseph
Received: May,10,2010 12:28:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Cape Hatteras beach access plan should protect nature and the environment first and secondarily allow equal access to all, which means that off-road vehicles should not take priority. Alternative D is the best to accomplish the NPS goals and to preserve irreplaceable birds and turtles that must have this habitat to survive. Additional pedestrian access is desirable, which would be open to all, but ORV access should be strictly limited to prevent damage and loss of wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 12601 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kurtz, mike A
Received: May,10,2010 12:28:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Murry,
 As a frequent and long time visitor to the nations parks system, especially Cape Hatteras National Seashore I am deeply disturbed at some of the positions the NPS is proposing in the DEIS plan published on March 12 2010. I understand and agree with the NPS duties to protect and preserve our natural resources. My main area of concern is when in the protection of these resources the NPS over steps its bounds, and in the case of the CHNS, completely restricts the public to the point that this wonderful magnificent resource cannot be enjoyed by most citizens who wish to spend time there. My main issues of concern are as follows and I have several questions which I don't think you addressed in the original DEIS plan.
 ? I disagree with the restrictions (as proposed in Alternative "F" p. 97-101) of the ORV access between ramps 27 and 30 at the Hatteras Inlet, Ocracoke Inlet, and all other locations in the park. There must be a method to allow pedestrian and ORV access points to these areas without disturbing the natural resources. ? I disagree with the severe restrictions (as proposed in Alternative "F" p. 104) not allowing night driving in the park. Over the past 40 years I have witnessed and enjoyed hundreds of sunsets and sunrises which cannot be viewed from any other areas in the park with the same majestic experience. These night closures would significantly reduce the time that the many fishermen can enjoy the resources at a time of day (during the PM hours) when the fishing can be the most productive and active. Given the right instruction on how to access these areas I know that all the individuals I have seen over the years could enjoy the park without disturbing the natural resource. ? I disagree with the prohibition of pedestrian access (as proposed in Alternative "F" p. 121) at the 8 different park locations from March 15 to July 31 each year. These locations have traditionally been available for all to enjoy. The removal of such large tracks of the park limits the overall positive experience that the park has to offer and significantly reduces ones desire to return to the seashore. ? I disagree with the drastic and large restrictions (as proposed in Alternative "F" p. 121-127) put on the public's ability to access certain parts of the beach when a piping plover or American Oystercatcher nest or brood exists in the park. These closures of such large tracts of park lands makes enormous parts of the park non accessible by the public. There must be a common sense compromise which both protects the natural resource and does not prohibit pedestrian and ORV access to some of the most valued parts of the park to visit. ? I disagree with the NO PET restriction (as proposed in Alternative "F" p. 136) from March 15 to July 31. This restriction must be reconsidered with a more stringent enforcement of the current 6' leash rule, year round. Over the 40 years I have been enjoying CHNS my family and hundreds of park guests I have seen and obeyed the current pet rules with no damage to the natural resource. You must consider that too many individuals, the only important thing in their lives is their pets. These individuals treat their pets as one of their family and would treat the park with the same respect. I disagree with the restriction of public

access with their pets in front of the many homes and businesses in the many towns that share, respect, and have been the primary caretakers of this area even before the NPS was there. I disagree and take real exception to the NPS analyses of the socio-economic impact of the actions taken in the DEIS and the negative drasitic effect it will have on the region and the state of N.C. as stated on p. 270-286 , 561-598. For the NPS to state as they do on p. 383 that the local region will have to "adapt" to the new rules I find insulting to the hardworking people in the region who have nothing but the best interest of the park for their entire lives. I have seen the effects of what some of the types of restrictions imposed over the last couple of years by the Federal Court Consent Decree will do to the local region. The loss of business, jobs, homes, and the noticeable loss of tourism has all been a direct effect to the restrictions on park access. The NPS proposal in the DEIS, Alternative "F" is more restrictive then the Consent Decree and therefore could be more damaging then what's already in place. There are many alternatives used in our society to allow public use to coexist without disturbing our natural resources. Many of these approaches the NPS uses in other parks in the park system. In Alternative "F" of the DEIS plan the NPS is taking the more restrictive approach at the expense of the public use. There is no credible science to back up the NPS plan in Alternative "F" and a less restrictive approach must be taken to allow both public use and resource management of one of the nation's most valuable resource.

Correspondence ID: 12602 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: HarrisI, Carolyn B
Received: May,10,2010 12:29:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree With the closing of the beaches for the piping plover and the oyster catchers. Also, I disagree with the prohibiting of pedestrian access from March 15-July 31 in 8 different beach locations. The economy of this island is based on tourism and if you close the beaches the tourist will not come here.

Correspondence ID: 12603 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:29:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have just become aware of the highly restrictive measures being considered for the protection of the fragile shore areas of the park(s) in question. Although I have unfortunately not made it down to the Hatteras area, from Vermont, in a couple years I do greatly enjoy vacationing in that area. I appreciate that you are thinking seriously on what is necessary in order to protect the natural area. However from my look at the proposal i am very concerned that it goes way too far in excluding human recreational uses. I come to the area in order to windsurf and enjoy the shore area. I believe its possible to protect the area while still allowing access for human recreation. Its important to look at each impact. I think something like ATV's are known to be quite destructive to plant life for instance, as well as being generally really annoying because they have a large sounds foot print for a whole area. however many uses by careful people are not as destructive.
i support the views of Dottie and the Coalition for Beach Access DEIS Assessment as written in their report dated 4/13/2010, which i copy below.
Do not protect the area at the expense of all human enjoyment, especially the ones that are shown to have a minimal impact. those human activities that are shown to have the most impact are the ones that should be limited the most.
i hope i am able to continue vacationing in the Hatteras seashore area, something i wont do if many of the policies in question are implemented.
thank you for your time and consideration
gideon turner burlington, vermont
--

Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 May 9, 2010

Re: Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Draft Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/EIS

Dear Mr. Murray:

This letter is sent to you as a public comment under your draft EIS referred to above.

As a frequent Cape Hatteras National Seashore visitor for 25 years and an Avon Village property owner since 1993, I have participated in all but one of the activities cited in the Figure 23 Visitor Activity Survey Results (Page 260). I would like to continue enjoying the recreation at the seashore for the remainder of my years, however I am gravely concerned that the preferred proposed Alternative F will severely impede this. As stated in the Act, Congress established the Seashore in 1937 as a national seashore for the enjoyment and benefit of the people, and to preserve the area. (page iv). Although I agree with the premise of protecting the natural resource, Alternative F would do so at the expense of humans, as well as the local economy and culture. .

Specifically my comments on the proposed plan:

- 1) I disagree: Page 121. To completely prohibit pedestrian access in sections of the national seashore, runs completely contrary to the basis upon which the Park was founded, for recreation. Pre-Nesting Closures All species: All designated Breeding Shorebird SMAs will be posted as pre-nesting closures using symbolic fencing by Mar 15 at sites involving piping plover, Wilson's plover, and/or American oystercatcher; and by Apr 15 at sitesinvolving only colonial waterbirds. The NPS will determine the configuration of specific pre-nesting closures based on an annual habitat assessment. Pre-nesting closures would be adjusted to the configuration of the Nonbreeding Shorebird SMAs for the respective sites (as described later in this table) if no breeding activity is seen in the area by Jul 31, or 2 weeks after all chicks have fledged, whichever comes later. Pre-nesting closures will not be modified in cases where the beach erodes into the buffered habitat. ORVs, pedestrians, and pets are prohibited within all resource closures, including pre-nesting closures. ML1: SMAs managed using ML1 measures would not allow ORV or pedestrian access when pre-nesting closures are in effect. ML2: The Bodie Island Spit, Cape Point, and South Point Ocracoke SMAs would be managed using ML2 measures in action alternatives C, E, and F. Once pre-nesting closures are implemented at these sites, a narrow ORV access corridor (where ORV use is permitted) or a pedestrian access corridor (where ORV use is not permitted) would be established. Upon the first observation of breeding activity, the standard buffers (please refer to table 11, Shorebird/Waterbird Buffer Summary) will apply, which depending upon the circumstances may close the access corridor. The Bodie Island Spit access corridor would follow the ocean shoreline to the inlet. The Cape Point access corridor would follow the ocean shoreline from ramp 44 south to the point, then west approximately 0.2 mile along the ocean shoreline. The South Point Ocracoke access corridor would follow the ocean shoreline south from ramp 72 to the inlet. Exact configuration of the corridor would be determined by NPS staff based on the annual habitat assessment. The ORV access corridor at ML2 sites will generally be no more than 50 meters wide above the high tide line (alternative E may include a designated pass-through zone where no stopping or recreation would be permitted in order to minimize disturbance). An ML2 pedestrian access corridor would generally be below the high tide line and would in no case be more than 10 meters above the high tide line. Pets, as well as kite flying, ball and Frisbee tossing, and similar activities, will be prohibited in the access corridors or pass-through zones (in alternative E only) while the pre-nesting closure is in effect.
- 2) I disagree. I find the proposed 1000 meter buffers cited on pages 121 ? 127 unnecessarily restrictive and arbitrary. The use of such large buffers will cause people to be forced into smaller areas, with a subsequent greater impact on resource in the area. In addition, the expansion of the buffers as a punitive measure for infractions is also arbitrary. Please do not punish all for the offenses of one.
- 3) I disagree. The complete prohibition of ORVs, year round, pp 97-101, is entirely unnecessary, and will also impede human ability to partake of many recreational activities in the stated areas between ramps 27-30, Hatteras Spit, Ocracoke Inlet and others.
- 4) I disagree. Pets have been part of my, and continue to be part of many visitors' recreation and vacation experience. I disagree with the proposal to completely prohibit pets at the seashore beaches during "breeding season" from March 15th to July 31st. Page 136. Pets on a leash will not interfere with wildlife protection measures.
- 5) I disagree. It has not been proven scientifically that human interference is extensively responsible for damage to turtles and nesting birds, (less than 3%) so the prohibition against night driving for over half of the year is unnecessarily restrictive. P 104, P 377. No piping plover deaths have been attributable to ORVs.
- 6) Page 468, I disagree. Access should be provided through all species management areas. Buffers should move with the species, instead of being expanded.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed plan. I look forward to a reasonable resolution of the issues, one that the Park, the

0012214

Visitors, the natural Resources and the Local Culture and Economy will find reasonable and sustainable.
Sincerely,

Correspondence ID:	12604	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 12:30:17						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	The EIS doses not fully address the economic impact to the region and the recommendations of Alternate "F" does not appear to take into consideration that our family has not been to the Outer Banks since the closures and we need to drive on the beach to allow my father who has Parkinson's disease an opportunity to fish. He can not walk and driving him to the beach and letting him fish from the vehicle is the best therapy we can give him. Please reinstate the interim plan to assist the elderly who need access to the beach for there well being. The interim plan did a great good job in balancing wildlife protection and providing needed therapy to elderly fishermen like my dad. The Recreational Area was designed to be for Recreation first and foremost. Tim Shields and Family						

Correspondence ID:	12605	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Olander, William T						
Received:	May,10,2010 12:33:16						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Mr. Jarvis, I am writing this e-mail with comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Study. I am a home owner on Hatteras Island in Buxton, N.C., with a legal residence in Bloomingdale, IL. I also have been visiting Hatteras Island every year since 1985. Please accept the following: 1) The impacts of this plan will affect millions of US citizens. Even here in Illinois, we constantly meet many people that have visited or have recurring visits Hatteras Island. They rave about the open access and space for their wanderings and enjoyment for either viewing wild nature or outdoor activities. 2) There should not be any closures of any of the beaches in any of the established villages for any reason except human life safety. Any bird, animal, or reptile that is endangered or threatened that chooses to establish a presence in an area of danger to its survival, does nothing to perpetuate the gene pool necessary for survival of that species. If a threatened species established a presence in Washington, DC the city would not be shut down, the species would be removed and relocated. This should be the only option and that should happen within 2 days of establishment. 3) The pet restriction on the seashore is ill conceived. Trained pets that are either leashed or disciplined to stay in the immediate proximity of their owners are no threat to anything. The pet ban language should be eliminated. 4) Vehicular closures should be confined to the beaches in the established villages from May thru November and to remote areas that have established nests. Once again, if a species established a presence on Interstate 95, it would be relocated and the Interstate would not be closed. As this Statement is written, if all of the aspects are accepted, there will be millions of dollars spent on enforcement and legal activities. These funds would be much better spent on species relocation to the vacant areas and shoals in the Pamlico, Albemarle, and Currituck Sounds or establishment of new ones. There are thriving natural areas in the sounds that are predator and activity free where species compete for life and space as they have since the dawn of life on Earth. The survivors of the natural processes are the species that adapt to conditions around them. This is scientific fact. Please contact me with any questions.						

Correspondence ID:	12606	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Peluso, Jane C						
Received:	May,10,2010 12:33:23						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	In all fairness I believe the public needs further comment time. The document presented is over 800 pages long and has been worked on for many months, it seems only fair that the public would have an equal amount of time to prepare a presentation also. Thanks for your consideration.						

Correspondence ID:	12607	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 12:34:14						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	In efforts to effectively manage the bird nesting areas and turtle egg laying areas on Cape Hatteras National Seashores it is IMPERATIVE that the park service not only work with the locals who depend on open and accessible beaches for their livelihoods but keep the beaches open to the public who depend on those areas for recreation. Corridors will allow access to the beaches while maintaining a most adequate 200 feet around nesting areas. 1000 feet is not only excessive but cannot be substantiated with science nor evidence. Please keep people in mind when making a final vote. The economy has so many americans out of work, out of money, out of hope. To add unnecessarily to these problems will compound this issue and make it increasingly difficult for the locals and those visitors that gain summer work around our beachse to make a living, which sustains their families. It's about the PEOPLE! Birds are important but not as important as PEOPLE. Thank you. Sandra Wallace						

Correspondence ID:	12608	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Irwin, Hannah						
Received:	May,10,2010 12:36:53						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Our world is quickly becoming devoid of pristine habitat and intact ecosystems. We do not need to contribute to this problem on our public lands by creating even more access for a high-impact, destructive recreation activity like off-road vehicles use. There are plenty of places available for this; please consider our wildlife and our coasts and keep the Cape Hatteras National Seashore for its beautiful wildlife, birds, and the quiet, low-impact users like bird watchers.						

Correspondence ID:	12609	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	mckeen, samuel						
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I am providing comments on behalf of the Durant Station Condominium Association, Inc., a 33-unit condominium project located on nearly 2 acres of ocean-front land in Hatteras Village, NC. I am the President of this Association, which is composed of families who own these properties for personal recreational use, as well as to generate rental income. After rebuilding the project in its entirety following total destruction by Hurricane Isabel in 2003, we all currently have sizable financial and emotional investments in this area of the Outer Banks. We are obviously directly affected by any form of restriction on the use of recreational assets of the area, with the National Seashore Beaches being the primary attraction! The beaches, along with their recreational opportunities, are the primary reason people visit the Outer Banks! Although we value birds and animals and enjoy viewing them, we						

believe that society's desire to protect and preserve selected species of birds and other wildlife must be "balanced" against legitimate human access to the unique recreational opportunities offered by National Seashore Beaches on the Outer Banks. We therefore disagree with any beach management approach, which would prevent human access to and recreational use of these beaches!! We believe that there are always creative ways available to manage human activities while protecting threatened and endangered species. We ask that regulatory authorities simply exercise sound logic and common sense.

We strongly disagree with the "NPS Preferred Alternative F" because we consider it to be unnecessarily restrictive of human recreational access. It fails to demonstrate why such a severe level of restricted access is needed or desirable. There is no proven scientific basis for asserting that any shorebird requires a 1,000 meter or larger buffer zone to prevent harm from human presence. Any buffer requirement should start as small as practicable, such as 10-20 meters. A buffer size should only be increased with the support of valid video-documented evidence that the existing buffer size is insufficient to prevent physical harm to the species. "Harm" should not be defined to include occasional "defensive posturing" or other normal and routine actions, including flight, which birds typically exhibit.

Pedestrian foot traffic such as anglers, surfers, beachcombers, runners, etc., which are commonly seen on beaches, should always be allowed to occur on beaches. Any proposed buffer zones for pedestrians should be substantially smaller than any corresponding buffer zones that apply to vehicles. No protection scheme should include a ban on foot traffic/pedestrian use! There is no evidence that shorebirds or other species are harmed in any way by pedestrians when given a small buffer zone to protect nesting activity. Common sense would indicate that a bird would typically not choose to nest in an area or amidst any level of activity, which it found to be uncomfortable and/or disruptive to its reproductive cycle.

We agree with and support the positions established by the Coalition for Beach Access (see <http://www.obpa-nc.org/position/statement.pdf> and <http://www.obpa-nc.org/position/assessment.pdf>).

We agree with and support the positions established by Dare County, NC (see <http://www.hatterasislandtimes.com/PDFs/DCDEIS.pdf>).

The current situation compels the public to rely on the NPS to establish and preserve a reasonable balance between the needs of wild life to reproduce and propagate their species and the rights of the public to access and enjoy its National Treasures, e.g., the Outer Banks National Seashore Beaches. The majority of residents and visitors do not seek out the relatively remote southern Hatteras Island areas simply to observe birds or turtles, although many of us enjoy both. Rather, the inherent enjoyment offered by beach access in its many forms, including fishing, certainly comprises the primary attraction.

It can be all too easy to loose track of the "big picture" when working through highly complex and contentious resource allocation issues, such as are currently being addressed. Please do not lose sight of the fact that humans, e.g., U.S. Citizens, are entitled to receive priority consideration in the non-destructive use and enjoyment of the Outer Banks' unique recreational resources.

The protocols put into place by the NPS to manage Outer Banks beaches should be an example of smart co-existence and balanced management practices, not extremist bans and excessively conservative management protocols driven by fear of punitive law suits. The current process appears to be forced upon us, in part, by "single-issue groups", who would seek to restrict the rights and recreational opportunities of the majority solely to further their well intended, yet extreme and unnecessarily restrictive views of appropriate conservation measures.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please weigh our views carefully in finalizing any regulatory regimes, which would restrict our access to land, which we as U.S. Citizens own in common.

Samuel McKeen President Durant Station Condominium Association, Inc.

Correspondence ID: 12610 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 12:38:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it my concern Regarding National Seashore access in Cape Hatteras NC.,

I have been travelling to Cape Hatteras for the past 18 years making a bi-annual trip for windsurfing/kitesurfing during the spring and fall. The conditions combined with the expansive, natural coastal setting make it one of the best places in the world for these water sports.

I do not oppose regulation that restricts large impact change to the local seashore, such as large construction projects for massive residential communities or industrial development. And I support protecting animals, birds and endangered species and their breeding/local habitat.

My view is such that regulations can be placed in logical places within the national seashore Park whilst still allowing access to non-motoized activities within or adjacent to these protected areas.

Regards,
Grant Bennet

Correspondence ID: 12611 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 12:38:29

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am an employee of Hatteras Realty and would like to add my comments in agreement with my employer, Stewart Couch.

Correspondence ID: 12612 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 12:40:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: It is my opinion that the plan A is the only management plan required to regulate the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. There is a "Finding of No Significant Impact" where ORV usage is concerned. I would also like to have my lifetime fishing license fee of \$250 returned from the state of North Carolina. The license is useless if I can not get to the recreational area. I am an avid fisherman, Yet I have had 6, Six surgeries on my knees. Without the use of my ORV, I am not able to enjoy the Recreational Area we are trying to protect for the future. "Alternative A would manage ORV use and access at the Seashore based on the 2007 Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Interim Protected Species Management Strategy / Environmental Assessment and the Superintendent's Compendium 2007, as well as elements from the 1978 draft interim ORV management plan that were incorporated in Superintendent's Order 7"

Correspondence ID: 12613 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Seward, Chris D

Received: May,10,2010 12:40:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

this is another example of the government falling prey to powerful lawyers and lobbying groups, ignoring the rights of its citizens to use national parks by twisting rules and regulations to fit the minority special interest groups.

the Cape Hatteras National seashore has long been a favorite for the outdoors enthusiasts that do more to support parks and recreation areas than any other group in the nation. we are the people that Teddy Roosevelt had in mind when he selected beautiful areas within our great nation to preserve for the citizens of America and travelers from all over the world to access and enjoy. unfortunately, special interest groups/eco terrorists have taken these beautiful areas that offer so much and use acts passed by government to protect endangered species as a vehicle to launch their illconceived plans with falsly supported statistics.

unfortunately, the average citizen that enjoys these facilities the most doesn't have the funds and contacts to hire powerful law firms and lobbyist to expose these frauds for who they are.

please, before you make a rash decision think about the hardworking people that pay your salaries that you are supposed to represent and allow them access to our national parks. also, think of the people in the Outer Banks who's livelihoods depend on access to these parks and the immense pleasure we all gain from that access. there is plenty of room for both people and birds to coexist

Correspondence ID:	12614	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 12:41:40						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Mr. Murray, I have been coming to the Outer Banks fishing for over 25 years. After reading through the DEIS it saddens me to think that those trips could soon come to an end. As a family, we fish when we go on vacation. We'll rent a house for a week, buy our groceries bait and supplies from the local island stores, then head out to the beach in our ORV to fish. If beach access is restricted or prohibited, and we cannot access The Point or South Ocracoke then we will find places other than CHNS to vacation. A plan needs to be put in place that supports recreation while conserving and protecting wildlife. Buffer areas that are expansive, that close areas of the beach due to their size (from the water to the dunes) and that are not based on sound scientific data will not be supported. I feel that any closures must have a ORV corridor so that one nest, while still being protected, will not close miles of beaches.</p> <p>Signed, Hap Clayton Stanley, NC</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12615	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Crelin Jr., Robert R						
Received:	May,10,2010 12:42:29						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I am a veteran along with many others who have given part of their lives to protect and to service the people of the United States of America. I have done so with pride in my country and it's freedoms. The present situation in the outer banks is more than unfair, it is a complete disregard to the people who live and try to make a home for themselves and their children. To completely forgo the mandates of the people as the seashore being set aside for the use of the people by the president is, in my opinion, uncalled for. The people I have had the pleasure of knowing and living with on the island are for the most part conservationists and sportsman. I have yet to see or hear of any flagrant disregard for life of the birds or the turtles by any of them. To just put boundaries up when a tire print or foot print is in the area of a nest is not only unfair, but totally unfair to the people who live there. Come on, for years they have been living with the birds and the turtles with little or no problem. Then one person starts a bunch of stuff and brings to light the fact that the park service did not do its job in forming the guidelines for the island and now all those who live and vacation there are being penalized for this... The United States is a government by the people and for the people, majority rules etc.. not special interest groups. If I can see where they are being abused or killed or mistreated, as a sportsman I would take up the cause, but it is not, and has not been done. So why, all the threats and the assault on the freedoms of the people now??? Keep em open, maintain them, but keep em open. The birds are still nesting and will continue to nest, it is nature...and in the hands of God, not committees or government..</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12616	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 12:42:54						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I am a fishing enthusiast and a lover of wildlife. I want to be able to drive my kids (when they come) out on the beach and go fishing. I value it as a great thing to be able to bond with family members and other people who enjoy the ocean and fishing! Complete closure to human use just sounds crazy.</p> <p>Please don't take away the one vacation I love making every year. Please don't do potential damage to local businesses!</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12617	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Zimmerman, Paulette						
Received:	May,10,2010 12:46:23						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	12618	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 12:49:41						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I disagree with much of the plan and hope that a more balanced, reasonable approach is taken that shifts the thrust of this proposal from turning the area from a recreational area to a wildlife sanctuary.</p> <p>Specifically I disagree with the provision that prohibits pets on the beach during the period 15 March to 31 August each year. This virtually eliminates certain visitors, not to mention locals, from recreational activities with their pets for no apparent reasons. There are reasonable alternatives in place currently -i.e. leash requirement.</p> <p>Our family has been coming to the Outer Banks, specifically Hatteras Island as visitors (and property owners) since the 1950's. We have seen changes - both good and ill- over the years. While it would be ideal to return to a more pristine period it is difficult to "unring the bell". As mentioned, a more</p>						

balanced approach is needed to ensure the park service fulfills its role as manager of a recreational area versus a preserve. I hope more rational forces prevail in the end.

Thank you for listening.

Richard and Charlotte McCray, and family Huntington, WV

Correspondence ID: 12619 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan is much better both for humans and for the wildlife, and I urge you to support Alternative D.
If the park decides to enact another plan, it should be sure to have the following requirements:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. If ORV use is continued within the park, half or more than half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. It would then be easier for families, walkers, and animals to enjoy the surroundings.
* Put Natural Resources First. Our first priority should be to protect the natural resources and the wildlife. Right now, the preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use. We must do all we can to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be closely following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12620 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:49:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12621 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:49:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12622 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:49:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12623 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 12:49:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

With only 2,000 breeding pairs of Threatened Piping Plover from Newfoundland to No. Carolina, greater protection from disturbance is warranted.

While visiting Hatteras during May 2005, we noted no plovers in areas accessible to OHVs; all plovers seen were in areas closed to vehicles. Restricting OHV use will also benefit a host of wildlife including sea turtles.

I support Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Sincerely, Tom Leskiw 5440 Cummings Road Eureka, CA 95503

Correspondence ID: 12624 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Moore, William E

Received: May,10,2010 12:49:57

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.

***** 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: 12625 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 12:51:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I disagree with adoption of Alternative F I agree and support adoption of Alternative A I agree with ORV permits at no charge. I disagree with penalizing the public with increased buffers due to the activities of a few individuals. I agree that that Regulatory Flexibility Act must be considered in the implementation of any rules. I disagree with night driving currently rules in effect. There is no data that supports that this has an effect on turtles. I agree that turtle nests should be moved to Pea Island which is a wildlife sanctuary. I disagree that there is little economic impact. As a rental home owner I can attest to the reduction in weeks rented since the DEIS has been implemented. Especially in the spring and fall fishing periods. People are less willing to take a risk of not being able to use their vehicles to fish or participate in beach activities. The reduction in my home is 25%. I disagree in the use of Northern beach economic date to support this program. Proper date needs to be considered and this should be from Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. I disagree that ORV are a threat to Piping Plovers. In the past few years 6 died from natural causes none from ORV's and 6 from pedestrians. Although I do not condone any deaths this represents .07%. I disagree that non threatened species are give extreme buffers as though they are threatened. Gordon Myers Ex Dir of the NC Wildlife Commission stated that this is a misuse of the intent for "species of concern". 1000 and 300 meter buffers are excessive. These should be reduced to 200 and 30 I disagree with pet and horse being excluded from the beaches. Pets should be allowed on the beach with leashes. Horses should be permitted also as they are in the control of the rider. I disagree with the killing of one specie in order to protect another .If this is an environmental way of protecting one from another then they need to rethink their priorities. I agree that corridors for ORV should

be provided throughout the beach area. I do not agree with the impression that this National Recreational Seashore adoption was to exclude and restrict humans from access to these exquisite beaches. The spirit and intent was to preserve the beaches wildlife and to live within reasonable bounds that would preserve nature, the environment and public. I disagree with closures to Bodie Island spit Caope Point and the Ocracoke North beach at Hatteras Inlet as well as th south beach. I disagree that NO AREA should be closed year round> this is excessive

Correspondence ID: 12626 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lauenstein, Paul
Received: May,10,2010 12:51:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Do not allow off-road vehicles on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. They are loud, dangerous, emit toxic fumes, tear up the landscape, and deprive their riders of much-needed exercise.
 Ear-splitting ORVs shatter the scenic and tranquil beauty of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. This park should be for everyone's quiet enjoyment, and protection of wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 12627 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hales, Christie C
Received: May,10,2010 12:53:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep the beaches at Hatteras Island open. This is a great natural resource that should be enjoyed by all. There are other ways to keep the birds and other wildlife safe. Most of the people using these beaches are good stewards of nature and want to preserve the natural beauty and life on the shorelines. We have been vacationing there for over 20 years. It is a great, safe, beautiful place for families. I think we can find ways to cohabitate with the endangered wildlife without closing beach access to people. I don't know all the pros and cons, just know that tourism is a way of life for islanders and closing the beaches would have negative impact on their ability to make a living.
 Please, find a way to make it work for all!!

Correspondence ID: 12628 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:54:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
 2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
 3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.
 4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."
 However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)
 5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.
 Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.
 6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.
 I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.
 Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.
 The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.
 Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.
 NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.
 7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.
 8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.
 9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,
 So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.
 10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the

Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

As a resident of Hatteras Island, we of the Hatteras Island community have always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "?prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:55:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please, don't let off road vehicles damage our fragile shores!

Correspondence ID: 12630 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Date: May 10, 2010 To: National Park Service From: Cami N. Gray Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments

My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledged rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I strongly disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging of the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Cami N Gray Resident of Hatteras Village on Hatteras Island, NC

Correspondence ID: 12631 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: O'Neal, Marianne J

Received: May,10,2010 12:56:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My family has lived on Hatteras Island in Hatteras Village for seven generations. There are no better stewards of the land and sea the the locals who inhabit this island. We are mindful of all living things and do what is needed to preserve and protect all creatures. To close the National Seashore is going against all of the promises that were made when the Park service first came here. We were told that our way of life would not be tampered with in any way. The selfinterest groups who wish to destroy our livelihood do not live here nor do they pay any taxes toward this community. While I may have an opinion on what goes on the the bigger outside world, I don't step in as an authority to change anyone elses way of life. We live here because we choose to. I only ask that you consider the promises made and keep them. Thank you for allowing my voice to be heard. Respectfully, Marianne O'Neal

Correspondence ID: 12632 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Kinnaird, Shelby

Received: May,10,2010 12:57:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Pea Island was established to be the wildlife refuge on Hatteras Island, the rest of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore was intended to be a RECREATIONAL area. The U.S. government promised this type of use to the hundreds of people who donated their land in order to create the seashore in the first place.

Why is it okay to tamper with nature in some cases but not others? It seems to okay to tamper if the actions will adversely affect park visitors, but not if the actions would actually benefit both nature and visitors. For example, it's okay to relocate turtle nests when storms are imminent, but not at other times. It's okay to set aside areas of the beach to replant "extirpated" seabeach amaranth, but it's not okay to clear vegetation at the Cape Point ponds to create a more favorable piping plover habitat (outside of the primary ORV corridor). It's okay to kill predators, but it's not okay to drive on the beach at night (which is a deterrent to predators).

My understanding is that most nest failures are caused by non-human events. For example, 54% are due to predators and 29% are due to storms and

tides. If nests can be relocated when storms are approaching, why can't they also be relocated to preserve ORV use in the seashore? Nests could be moved to the nearby dredge and spoil islands, which typically have fewer predator threats anyway.

Page vi - "Visitor experience could be affected by conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreation users." - I have been living in Avon for almost four years and I have never heard of a single "conflict" between pedestrian and ORV users. The majority of the people who come here to use the beach as a recreational area do so with an ORV, especially those who have difficulty walking in sand. Are there any documented cases of a pedestrian being injured by an ORV on the beach?

Page vi - "Other issues related to visitor use and experience include viewsheds, aesthetics, and night skies. While the sight of ORVs can destroy the viewshed and aesthetics for some visitors, they also change the viewshed by altering the natural landscape." - And what do the signs and strings announcing closures do to the aesthetics of the seashore? I'd much rather see an ORV on the horizon than have to view the signs and strings everywhere.

Page 1 - "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Seashore, and continue to be the most practical available means of access and parking for many visitors." - Pedestrian only areas discriminate against people with physical handicaps, those who have difficulty walking due to age and small children. My uncle, a fisherman recovering from a brain tumor and lung cancer, has difficulty walking in the sand from ramp parking lots to the beach. Without an ORV, he won't be able to enjoy the beach at all. I'm sure there are many other stories similar to his.

Pages 86-87 - Why does the NPS resist using some of the more proactive techniques to encourage turtle nesting? Captive rearing, routine nest relocation and hatcheries are used successfully at other East Coast locations.

Page 136 - "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during breeding season including in front of the villages" - I live in Avon. Do you mean that if I'm driving up Highway 12 between Avon and Salvo, I can't stop in one of the parking areas to allow my pet to urinate if the need arises? And I can't walk my dog on the beach? I think this is too restrictive and pets on 6 foot leashes should be allowed in the seashore year round.

Page 210 - "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk." - How many piping plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs? How many to pedestrians? How many to non-human factors?

Pages 392-396 - Why doesn't the NPS address the environmental issues that are more detrimental to turtle recovery success than ORVs/pedestrians? For example, 38.5% of nests had 0 hatchlings due to weather events. The 2009 Loggerhead Recovery Plans calls this "catastrophic."

Page 468 - "If breeding activity or scraping is observed outside of an existing closure, buffers would be expanded" - Why would the buffer be expanded instead of moved?

Socioeconomic analysis (pages 270-281 and 561-598) - The Region of Influence includes the Northern Beach communities of Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from the seashore and any issues of ORV use. Inclusion of these communities in the ROI dilutes all estimates of economic impact to the seashore villages. Also, I can't find anywhere that the DEIS addresses that the primary economic impacts will be felt by small, locally owned businesses. Economic analyses contained in the DEIS do not appear to use all data available from the first FULL year of the 2009 Consent Decree. Visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial, who may or may not visit the actual seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12633 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Westermann, Steven
Received: May,10,2010 12:58:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative "F" requires far too much clearance for birds, I believe we should move incrementally (such as) starting with 200 meter clearance for a brood and studying the effectiveness of this. The people have been assured the right to access in order to recreate in our park systems year around and we need to balance the commision to protect the resource with the needs of the taxpayers who enable the resource to be protected and provide jobs for the park service. The proposals offered in Alternative "F" limit the ability to rest and recreate during the time of year when the public is most desiring and able (because of school requirements) to use the resource. "We the people" need to be the largest part of this equation. We the people of Hatteras love the culture and the wildlife as much as anyone and only desire to find reasonable policy on which to agree. The economic impact on the local businesses and property owners has not been addressed adequately or accurately, inacting such radical changes in the most severe housing crisis and economy in our history will no doubt cause more failure and more taxpayer rescue to an already disasterous economy. Please show wisdom and restraint in how you proceed with these changes, for the animals and the people.

Correspondence ID: 12634 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:58:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I AM AGAINST! THE PARK SERVICE CLOSING OF BEACHES, TO CARS OR PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC. I HAVE A HOME IN AVON , AND IT WOULD DEVISTATE OUR ECONOMY....THANK YOU
MICHAEL HERZING

Correspondence ID: 12635 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 12:58:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with your proposal on closing the beaches. The birds on this island have survived for years. Nature has a way of takng care of all wildlife without human involoment. The closing of the beaches will effect the livelihood of all residents within this area and the best surf fishing in the state. I have been traveling to this area for forty years and believed Federal parks were open to me and all citizens of United States

Correspondence ID: 12636 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, Lisa
Received: May,10,2010 13:00:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been coming to the Outer Banks for 30 years this year. For me Hatteras Island is a place where I find solitude, a place I go to activate a recharging of my soul. It's a favorite part of my life these days to be able to have a week at what I believe is the most beautiful beach on the East coast. Once there I am finally able to let my mind reorganize and as soon as time permits I find one of my favorite spots and DRIVE down the beach where I park my SUV along side the ocean at last being able to sit with my arthritic body and melt away all the stress and pain from the long days of a tormented life.
If I can not drive to my favorite spot and sit at the ocean and look upon one of Gods greatest and most beautiful gifts, what is there for me to look forward to? I ask you, where will I go that I can access the beach and be able to do this alone. The one thing I am able to do without help, without that familiar loss of dignity.
As a citizen, a caretaker of mother earth, as a inhabitant of this planet, and as a lover of this great beach I humbly ask that it be preserved and protected as a eco-human beach. PLEASE<<<<<<Keep our beaches open!

Correspondence ID: 12637 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:00:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do as much as you can to protect the wildlife and natural resources of Hatteras Island. Recreation of humans (and yes, unfortunately even economics) need to be secondary considerations when compared with survival of species.

Correspondence ID: 12638 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:01:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please, do not stop access to the North Carolina Outer Banks to the humans that work hard to keep it clean and safe for all forms of life, human and animal. Restrictions brought on by legal blackmail are not made with the interest of of native outerbankers, native north carolinians and vacationers in my state. Comprise ...common sense...peoples livelyhoods , depend on you understanding that the out of doors is to be cherished, and enjoyed by people who love it. Not people who want to control it for a political and selfish agenda. Thank you for your service to my state. Capt. E.J.Hales III

Correspondence ID: 12639 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hegedus, Steve
Received: May,10,2010 13:01:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family and I have been coming to the Outer Banks and have enjoyed the seashore for the past 30 years. We have brought our children to the beach when they were little, up until they were young adults. We have driven on the beach each time we come, fished, and have total respect for the privilege to access it. My wife and I both recently retired and have filled out some of the necessary paperwork to volunteer for the park service. That is how much we LOVE the outer banks.
We totally support the local economy when we visit, grocery stores, bait shops, tackle shops, resturants, ect. If access to the beach doesn't continue the economy will fail in that area. These are the hardest working people we have ever come to know.
After all, having access to the National Seashore is out RIGHT.

Correspondence ID: 12640 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:03:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The principle activity aided by ORV access on these beaches is best described as multiple-use. This concept has developed over many years of public experience without resource conflict. ORV operation provides the flexibility to respond to the rapid weather and ecological changes that occur along these shifting strands of sand. Weather, wind, and waves often dictate where and when a particular recreation will be practiced. The proposal also gives consideration to year-round and seasonal pedestrian use. Seasonal ORV use is contemplated only in non-peak visitation times of the year in front of villages. Year-round pedestrian closures are contemplated where pedestrian visitors can easily access and use beaches free of ORV traffic.

Correspondence ID: 12641 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Rudar, Paul R
Received: May,10,2010 13:05:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern, After trying to digest the 810 page document DEIS.Plans for Cape Hatteras National recreational seashore.I am at the conclusion that it is A illegal document. It is far from what this park was established for in the 1940's."Public recreational seashore access".It also dose not address the history or culture of the people that live and work there.It protects birds that are not threatened or endangered.To be frank it is A 810 page piece of crap. There are no good alternatives that are acceptable.I could go on and on but I will not waste you time or mine. Perhaps just go back in time to the interim management plan which by the way worked just fine.The consent decree was brought on by dishonest lawyers and A biased judge.These lawyers have no real reason to even have a say here but they saw dollar signs and picked apart the Park service in court.To the point you all are now spineless.And are afraid not to appease them. Sincerely, Paul R. Rudar

Correspondence ID: 12642 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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. Why would this be? ORVs are noisy and destructive plus they are polluting!! Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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 Heminger

Correspondence ID: 12643 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:05:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

I disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

I disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

PROTECT, NOT PROHIBIT!

Thank you!
Regards,
Edas Zemaitis

Correspondence ID: 12644 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:05:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. Let me first state my general reaction and conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed. It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date. The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Here are my specific comments:

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors." However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the

DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules.

(p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 12645 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:06:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

I disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

I disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

PROTECT, NOT PROHIBIT!

Thank you,
-Edas Zemaitis-

Correspondence ID: 12646 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."
However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a

way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

As a homeowner and lifelong visitor to the island, it is simply unfair to not allow access to the beach during these times

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

We own a house that rents out as pet friendly. More than 70% of our renters bring their pets to enjoy their vacation at the beach. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation home. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

Furthermore I can not understand why we would design a beach plan around certain animals and at the same time ban animals such as dogs from the beach. Any animal should have the same rights on the beach, not just birds and turtles. Who is fighting for the dogs rights in this case? 15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, keep our beaches open to humans, pets and vehicles. This is a way of life on Hatteras Island. I as well as many people believe guidelines should be in place to help protect the environment and animal population. I believe this protection and help for the environment and animals does not need to come at the expense of the people. This really just needs to be approached in a more cooperative way that would have such a negative economic effect on the area.

Correspondence ID: 12647 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:08:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I urge the preservation of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore by protecting it from the damage that can be inflicted by off-road vehicles on the fragile beaches and dunes. I support the protection of our National Parks, National Wildlife Refuges, National Seashores, National Forests and National Monuments and urge that all possible measures be taken to save them from human-inflicted damage and exploitation.

Correspondence ID: 12648 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial

Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules.

(p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 12649 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Bowden, Mary C
Received: May,10,2010 13:12:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please preserve the beaches for all to use not q select few who can afford to buy ocean front property.

Correspondence ID: 12650 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Bull, Barbara J
Received: May,10,2010 13:14:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: A National Seashore Recreational Area should be an area on the nation's seashore that can be used for recreation. That is what the name implies. Birds have learned to live in harmony with humans. A Bald Eagle recently built a nest in the midst of a highway construction zone. Construction was well underway when the nest began to appear. The noise of construction was perhaps music to her ears. Along the shores of Ocracoke, how will you protect the birds from the incoming tide? Most of the vehicles that drive along this portion of the coast are near the tideline and birds are smart enough not to nest in those locations. Please leave "recreation" on our National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12651 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: daniel, james g
Received: May,10,2010 13:15:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 May 9, 2010
 Re: Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Draft Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/EIS
 Dear Mr. Murray:
 I am writing this letter to comment on the DEIS referred to above.
 I have been a frequent visitor to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore for over 25 years and an Avon Village property owner since 1993 and have participated in most of the activities cited in the Figure 23 Visitor Activity Survey Results (Page 260). I would like to continue enjoying the recreation at the seashore for another 25 years but I am very concerned that the preferred proposed Alternative F will severely impede this. As stated in the Act, Congress established the Seashore in 1937 as a national seashore for the enjoyment and benefit of the people, and to preserve the area. (page iv). Although I agree with the premise of protecting the natural resource, Alternative F would do so at the expense of humans, as well as the local economy and culture. .
 Specifically my comments on the proposed plan:
 1) I disagree: Page 121. To completely prohibit pedestrian access in sections of the national seashore, runs completely contrary to the basis upon which the Park was founded, for recreation. Pre-Nesting Closures All species: All designated Breeding Shorebird SMAs will be posted as pre-nesting closures using symbolic fencing by Mar 15 at sites involving piping plover, Wilson's plover, and/or American oystercatcher; and by Apr 15 at sites involving only colonial waterbirds. The NPS will determine the configuration of specific pre-nesting closures based on an annual habitat assessment. Pre-nesting closures would be adjusted to the configuration of the Nonbreeding Shorebird SMAs for the respective sites (as described later in this table) if no breeding activity is seen in the area by Jul 31, or 2 weeks after all chicks have fledged, whichever comes later. Pre-nesting closures will not be modified in cases where the beach erodes into the buffered habitat. ORVs, pedestrians, and pets are prohibited within all resource closures, including pre-nesting closures. ML1: SMAs managed using ML1 measures would not allow ORV or pedestrian access when pre-nesting closures are in effect. ML2: The Bodie Island Spit, Cape Point, and South Point Ocracoke SMAs would be managed using ML2 measures in action alternatives C, E, and F. Once pre-nesting closures are implemented at these sites, a narrow ORV access corridor (where ORV use is permitted) or a pedestrian access corridor (where ORV use is not permitted) would be established. Upon the first observation of breeding activity, the standard buffers (please refer to table 11, Shorebird/Waterbird Buffer Summary) will apply, which depending upon the circumstances may close the access corridor. The Bodie Island Spit access corridor would follow the ocean shoreline to the inlet. The Cape Point access corridor would follow the ocean shoreline from ramp 44 south to the point, then west approximately 0.2 mile along the ocean shoreline. The South Point Ocracoke access corridor would follow the ocean shoreline south from ramp 72 to the inlet. Exact configuration of the corridor would be determined by NPS staff based on the annual habitat assessment. The ORV access corridor at ML2 sites will generally be no more than 50 meters wide above the high tide line (alternative E may include a designated pass-through zone where no stopping or recreation would be permitted in order to minimize disturbance). An ML2 pedestrian access corridor would generally be below the high tide line and would in no case be more than 10 meters above the high tide line. Pets, as well as kite flying, ball and Frisbee tossing, and similar activities, will be prohibited in the access corridors or pass-through zones (in alternative E only) while the pre-nesting closure is in effect.
 2) I disagree. I find the proposed 1000 meter buffers cited on pages 121 ? 127 unnecessarily restrictive and arbitrary. The use of such large buffers will cause people to be forced into smaller areas, with a subsequent greater impact on resource in the area. In addition, the expansion of the buffers as a punitive measure for infractions is also arbitrary. Please do not punish all for the offenses of one. 3) I disagree. The complete prohibition of ORVs, year round, pp 97-101, is entirely unnecessary, and will also impede human ability to partake of many recreational activities in the stated areas between ramps 27-30, Hatteras Spit, Ocracoke Inlet and others.
 4) I disagree. Pets have been part of my, and continue to be part of many visitors' recreation and vacation experience. I disagree with the proposal to completely prohibit pets at the seashore beaches during "breeding season" from March 15th to July 31st. Page 136. Pets on a leash will not interfere with wildlife protection measures.
 5) I disagree. It has not been proven scientifically that human interference is extensively responsible for damage to turtles and nesting birds, (less than 3%) so the prohibition against night driving for over half of the year is unnecessarily restrictive. P 104, P 377. No piping plover deaths have been attributable to ORVs.
 6) Page 468, I disagree. Access should be provided through all species management areas. Buffers should move with the species, instead of being expanded.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed plan. I look forward to a reasonable resolution of the issues, one that the Park, the Visitors, the natural Resources and the Local Culture and Economy will find reasonable and sustainable.
 Sincerely,
 James Daniel 12321 Meadow Drive Berlin, MD 21811

Correspondence ID: 12652 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Walker, Tim L
Received: May,10,2010 13:15:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I endorse the positions of the Dare County Board of Commissioners.

Correspondence ID: 12653 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Millen, Joyce
Received: May,10,2010 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. I grew up in Virginia and regularly visited the Outer Banks to enjoy its natural beauty, undeveloped beaches, and birds and other wildlife. Unfortunately all of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. This approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of

the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.

3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12654 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Clark, Terry
Received: May,10,2010 13:16:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The limitations to beach access are extreme. The seashore is a public resource to be enjoyed by all and always has been. With limited access, less people will visit the seashore to enjoy the beach and recreational fishing. We don't extreme governmental restrictions on the access.

Correspondence ID: 12655 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I've called the Outer Banks home for over 13 years. I do not even own a four-wheel drive vehicle and I am saddened and dismayed by what has transpired over the past few years and even further upset by the new ORV management plan which has been developed. I pray the NPS will consider making modifications to this proposed plan. The plan is over-restrictive and will severely limit the public's ability to access and enjoy the most beautiful beaches on the east coast. The same beaches we were promised unfettered access to years ago when the National park was designated. Below are my comments pertaining to the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." I don't recall any Piping Plover deaths that are directly related to ORVs. Furthermore, with increased signage and better education of the public I feel both protected species and humans can still share the same area

2) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches for a longer amount of time in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages (May 15 to September 15 period) for the Northern beaches. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15. This way everyone is clear and consistent for the closed times, our visitors are not confused and our staff can appropriately guide our visitors. The different closure periods will do nothing but confuse visitors and result in (an unfairly) higher amt of violations!

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."
 Pedestrian only areas will not allow handicapped persons or families with small children to access the beaches easily. People wishing to engage in watersports which require equipment such as surf boards, ocean kayaks, fishing tackle etc will not find it easy to transport their gear to the beaches by foot. This will severely limit the recreational opportunities our beaches permit and our visitors (and residents) have grown to love and appreciate.

5) Page 53: Special use permit proposed guidelines. I do not feel this protocol effectively allows a handicapped or disabled person to access the beaches. The handicapped person must have another person drive them to the beach and walk back to the beach after they have parked their car. This is impractical, especially for someone who is accustomed to fishing alone. Furthermore, this also essentially doubles the amount of ORV traffic on the beaches. If the person could simply drive to destination, park and drive home after fishing as opposed to 2 separate trips your plan proposes.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with range and the size of the buffers as presented. The proposed bird buffers are too large. What if ORV pass-thru only corridors were implemented which used breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection but still offered protection for nesting birds? These corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors could provide access and allow species protection.
 Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too excessive and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover.
 Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. A 30 meter buffer should be sufficient for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.
 NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely the dredge and spoil islands that are located just off of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.
 Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the ferry Channel in the Pamlico Sound are full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. These birds are breeding successfully with no predators and are not included in the NPS stats.

9) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues of Hatteras Island and the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. This 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.
 Our residents and visitors have long appreciated our beaches and the family-fiendly recreational opportunities that they present. Our local economy is dependent on these same family-oriented, cultural and multi-generational beach outings. Whether it be fishing, swimming, sunning or sea shell hunting? this is a profound cultural and lifestyle impact which cannot be overlooked. The DEIS proposes to close off most of the south beach area during the summer. The same time most local residents (and visitors) use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is paramount to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

10) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages
 ? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.
 ? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.
 On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.
 This is simply not true. Hatteras Island has already experienced severe economic hardship under the consent decree, and Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial. Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses. Many visitors have decided not to visit because they cannot use the resources they are accustomed to. Rental income suffers first but then there is a domino effect? restaurants see a drop in business, retail sales drop, etc. This domino effect has resulted in home foreclosures (both year-round homes and vacation homes), bankruptcies, job lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts. Many businesses

have had to cut employee hours, forgo capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. Our economy is based on tourism. Without visitors, we have no income. When visitors cannot access our beautiful beaches, they will not return.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The US Park Services answer is both pretentious and absolutely FALSE: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is absolutely wrong.

11) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site in Manteo and the Wright Brothers National Memorial in Kill Devil Hills. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities do not visit the National Seashore beaches. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas should not be included.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fishermen want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they cannot access these areas, they simply will not visit. If they don't come, they will not rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. Again: Our economy is based on tourism. Without visitors, we have no income. When visitors cannot access our resources, they will not return.

12) Page 136: I strongly disagree with the DEIS pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 to July 31.

As an avid beachcomber and dog owner, this is detrimental to public access. My dog is a huge part of my family. He is always on a leash and not allowed to roam free. Our area is a very pet-friendly destination, many families enjoy bringing their pets on vacation. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs. I also believe owners of pets who are not leashed and properly restrained should be fined. Responsible pet owners should not be punished by the irresponsible actions of a few. 13) Pages 125; 392 to 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores including relocating nests to more desirable locations. The proposed buffer areas are very excessive for the protection of the turtles.

14) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. These areas are miles away from the nearest parking or paved road area and simply too far to access on foot. There has been no record of breeding piping plovers or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years. Closing off entire areas that are not even utilized by breeding birds is OVER PROTECTION and unfair access restriction!

15) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 to September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events as well as adding reflective signage to closure areas would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

16) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally always been available. These areas should remain open and accessible to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Correspondence ID: 12656 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:19:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Pismo Beach is a beautiful strand of light brown sand in California. It has had years of automobile traffic on the beach as well as dune buggies and other off road vehicles back in the dunes. Pismo Beach State Park manages the beach and Oceano Dunes State Vehicle Recreation Area manages the dunes. There was an ongoing battle over the use of vehicles in this area, but it has been solved finally with a little give and take between the conflicting groups, mainly beach goers, vehicles, fishermen, and environmentalists.

Some areas of the beach are completely closed to all vehicles except state park ranger patrols. The off road dune area is strictly managed and limited to keep the sands from becoming free to shift and move, which had been resulting in the dunes encroaching on farmland. Wildlife--plants and animals--are protected.

I suggest and even recommend that you talk with the rangers at these two state parks in order to see how this has all been accomplished. You might ask how they could improve upon the situations if they could do it over.

The following is taken directly from the Oceano Dunes State Vehicle Recreation Area Website: http://www.parks.ca.gov/default.asp?page_id=406. Not all of it is applicable, but it may be useful.

{This off road area is among the most popular and unique of California State Parks. The 5 = miles of beach open for vehicle use and the sand dunes available for off highway motor vehicle recreation are attractions for visitors from throughout the United States.

{Oceano Dunes is the only California State Park where vehicles may be driven on the beach. Passenger cars can easily drive on the northern portion of the beach.

{Four wheel drive vehicles are recommended for driving to the camping and off highway vehicle use areas in the park.

{Beach wheelchairs are available for loan at the Pier and Grand Avenue entrances to the beach.

{Surfing, swimming, surf fishing, horseback riding and bird watching are popular activities.

{Location/Directions {The recreation area is located in Oceano, three miles south of Pismo Beach off Highway 1.

{One mile south of the Pier Avenue beach ramp is Post 2, a post on the beach which marks the beginning of the off-highway vehicle riding and camping area.

{OHV's must be transported to this point before unloading. Any areas on the beach or in the dunes that are fenced or signed are closed to vehicular use because they either contain sensitive plant and animal life or are private property.

{Seasons/Climate/Recommended clothing

{Summer temperatures ? Highs: 60's and 70's; Lows: 50's; Dense morning fog

{Winter temperatures ? Highs: 50's and 60's; Lows: 40's; high winds in Spring

{The weather is often quite changeable, layered clothing is recommended.}

Thank you for reading this.

Correspondence ID: 12657 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:19:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12658 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:19:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12659 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:19:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12660 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:19:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Date: May 10, 2010
To: National Park Service
From: Andrew DiMartino

Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments

My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial

Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

As a lifelong resident of Hatteras Island, we of the Hatteras Island community have always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs,

cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Andrew DiMartino

Correspondence ID: 12661 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:19:57

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: 12662 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:19:57
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: 12663 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:19:57
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.
Keep the beaches vehicle free, no matter whether human or engine powered. Set up a course nearby for ORV and charge a HUGE fee for access to fund the upkeep.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12664 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: spencer, richard t
Received: May,10,2010 13:20:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please limit the number of beach accesses you have closed to no more than two at a time.

Correspondence ID: 12665 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Ellington, Herb L
Received: May,10,2010 13:21:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Keep the beaches open for the next generations of outer banks visitors and residents. My father drove the family down to Cape Point starting in the early 1960's yearly. Generations of my family have worked and visited the Buxton area for decades. We understand fully what a partial beach closure would do to the economic conditions of this area.
Even a partial closure will have a negative impact on this already distressed economic region of North Carolina. Dare County makes a noble plea to the NPS to keep the beaches open. Dare County will suffer from the loss of tax revenues resulting from beach closures. The NPS must be willing to keep an open mind on the economic issues surrounding the issues of beach access. Respect of mother nature is a lesson we all should strive to teach the next generations. That is a core value that the NPS should hold close to it's heart. If we have come to the point that a total closure of an area is the only solution to the problem then we are in alot more trouble than just the issue of beach closure.
I have tried to keep an open mind and read as much as I could from both sides of this issue. There does seem to be a lack of "common sense" expressed from both sides of this issue. I understand that I "lean" towards beach access for all because that is what I have come to believe the Outer Banks of North Carolina are there for. However, I have tried to keep an open mind on the issue of wildlife protection and habitat preservations. Surely, there can be a middle ground for both parties.
I strongly plea and pray that the use of "common sense" can be achieved during this process. Both sides been to be able to understand the needs and

desires of the other and surely men can reach a middle ground of good plain common sense on this issue. The political views of a few well funded and organized groups appear to have the upper hand on beach closure. I ask the NPS to exercise good judgement on this issue. America is by far the best place on the planet to live. The Outer Banks are one of the best places in America to live and visit. Let's not lose that over an agenda that is based on political viewpoints.

Keep the beaches open to all for generations to come.

Correspondence ID: 12666 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Newsome, Stephen L

Received: May,10,2010 13:21:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To The National Park Service:

I am the owner of a house in Salvo, NC and I am deeply disturbed by your decision to pursue alternative F of the DEIS. We were alarmed last year when the beach we normally use at Ramp 23 was not only closed to ORV access but was completely closed to even foot traffic. I have also learned that again this ramp will be closed for the supposed breeding season of the Piping Plover and non-threatened Oyster Catcher. We also learned that foxes, racoons, and possums were destroyed in the pursuit of preservation. I don't see how this could be viewed in any way as preservation of wildlife. What is really going on in my opinion is an act of control by the environmentalist for not necessarily control of the Outer Banks but for using this as a bargaining chip for some other cause they have down the road.

If sheer numbers of park police and funding is the majore hurdle, I for one would be for beach permits for access. It's unfortunate that under your plan my children will not be able to experience the Hatteras Island I grew up with.

Please reconsider your support for alternative F.

Thanks,

Steve Newsome

Correspondence ID: 12667 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Hibbs, Ralph

Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Date: May 10, 2010

To: National Park Service

From: Ralph and Carol Hibbs

Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments

My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closure rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial

Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fishermen want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31. 15)

Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you Ralph Hibbs

Received: May,10,2010 13:26:20

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The priority for our pristine and protected areas should be for its ecosystem, inclusive of its native animal and plant species. Second to that it should be for low-impact recreational activity, including the presence of pedestrian users. While the use of ORVs is sometimes necessary in these environments, protected areas should not be opened-up for excessive, unlicensed and unmonitored use by motorized recreationists. ORV tours by certified personnel may be one possible compromise to accommodate those who are unable or unwilling to enjoy these ecotreasures on foot.

Correspondence ID: 12669 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, C

Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My Comments concern the DEIS of the ORVMP prepared by the National Park Serv(NPS) for the Cape Hatters National Seashore Recreation Area.

- 1) Page 201 - I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk(from pedestrians & ORVs). -- No piping plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations have continued to decrease as signage & education improve. Pedestrian violations have been more significant than ORV violations.
- 2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear ft of beachfront..." -- If you close off huge areas of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment & Diminished visitor experience.
- 3) Page xix & pg 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North & South facing beaches as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras, & Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please make them the same: May 15 to Sept 15.
- 4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."
- 5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.
- 6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.
- 7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.
- 8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.
- 9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%, So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.
- 10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.
- 11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.
- 12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.
 - ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages
 - ? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.
 - ? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back

employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion: Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Correspondence ID: 12670 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:33:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We just recently built a investment home in Frisco and I feel the restrictions being proposed will alter the volume of renters that will visit our beaches in the future. With the economy down, the last thing we need is to drive vacationers away. My new home will end up like all other foreclosures in the area. KEEP THE BEACHES PEOPLE FRIENDLY.

Correspondence ID: 12671 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Voronyak, Michael G
Received: May,10,2010 13:34:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I can understand the use of an ORV to get to a destination and back. I cannot understand driving around having "fun" ruining the landscape. Visitors will be unable to enjoy the scenic natural beauty if they have to endure wheel tracks and vehicles running up and down the beach and around other areas. Destroying flora and fauna should not be part of "fun."

Correspondence ID: 12672 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:34:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

- Page vi "Visitor experience could be affected by conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreation users" - Disagree. Need to provide past evidence of such incidents. This blanket statement has no facts behind it.
- Page xi "The NPS used the Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee's input to create this action alternative, which is designed to provide visitors to the Seashore with a wide variety of access opportunities for both ORV and pedestrian users." - Disagree. I have reviewed this document as well as the 77 page document submitted by the Coalition for Beach Access at NEG-REG and find the Coalitions recommendations the best alternative for management of ORV use in Cape Hatteras National Resource Area.
- Page 83. "Because it is not administered by the NPS, the Seashore cannot direct the visitor use at Pea Island NWR." - Disagree - Pea Island is a prime, pedestrian-only area for visitors to the seashore. Not using this causes an overstatement of the need for more ORV free areas.
- Page 210. "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk." - Disagree - No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations.
- Page xxiv. "Carrying capacity would be a "peak use limit" determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront..." - Disagree - Capacity is more restrictive on Bodie Island and Ocracoke than at Cape Point.

6. Page 265. "Figure 25 shows the distribution of ORVs across these areas on Memorial Day and the Fourth of July in 2008." - Disagree - The ORV counts provided in this data fail to show that Bodie Island Spit and Cape Point were closed to ORV access on these dates due to resource protection closures. This, therefore, increased ORV congestion at ramps 4, 43, 44 and 49.
7. Page xix. Shorter Off-Season ORV Access on South Facing Villages - Disagree - Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages closures to ORV access are longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages (see p.23)
8. Page 1. "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Seashore, and continue to be the most practical available means of access and parking for many visitors." - Agree - Pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment.
9. Page 58. Beach access would be provided through the issuance of special use permits for areas in front of the villages to allow ORVs to transport disabled visitors to the beach and then return the vehicle back to the street. - Disagree - Why will Special Use permits to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches require the vehicle to be returned to the street, creating unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of emergencies?
10. Page 61. - Disagree with the relocation of Ramp 2 to 0.5 miles south of Coquina Beach as financially irresponsible. The money can be better spent to enlarge the parking lot and provide pedestrian and handicapped accessible ramps to the beach at Ramp 1 since it will be closed to ORV use to increase the "Pedestrian Only" area.
11. Page 263 - Alternative F - Disagree - This alternative ignores the longstanding need for a soundside access ramp on Bodie Island.
12. Page 468 - Restrictive Species Management Areas - Disagree - MLI is overly restrictive. Pedestrian and ORV corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during the entire breeding and nesting season (within guidelines) to maintain access. The buffers in MLI and ML@ are inflexible.
13. Pages 121-127 - Disagree - Buffers overall are too large. Much more restrictive than being used at Camp Lejeune for breeding buffers. Use breeding/nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access is always maintained. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not be expanded due to movement.
14. Page 124 - Pro-Active Adaptive Management - Agree - NPS should aggressively pursue the adaptive management initiatives identified in the DEIS with an object to improve its success with both resource protection and visitor access. The initiatives identified include: Vegetation management; Habitat Management; Enhanced Predator Management; Colonial Waterbird social attraction; Piping plover chick fledge rate; Piping Plover chick buffer distance; Pass-through buffers during the incubation period.
15. Page 124. "Should adaptive management initiatives and other research provide information that the NPS believes is an adequate basis for management changes, such changes would be evaluated and considered for implementation as part of the 5-year periodic review process described at the end of this table." - Disagree - Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of Pro-Active Adaptive Management should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process.
16. Page 125. Night Driving Restrictions - Disagree - May 1 - November 15 is too restrictive. The current period of May 1 - September 15 has worked for many years.
17. Page 125. DEIS Hatch Window Closures - Disagree - The DEIS proposals are excessive. Current practices are working well. The island residents can monitor nests via the Turtle Night Nest Watch Team. Closures should be 10 meters square during the day, Use Pea Island style keyhole pattern fence to the surf line at night.
18. Page 377. "ORV and other recreational use would have long-term major adverse impacts on sea turtles due to the amount of Seashore available for ORV use and by allowing nighttime driving on the beach." - Disagree - Major Adverse (NPS definition, p. 369) events have not occurred at the Recreational Areas - Night driving restrictions are not necessary. Nesting females have not "been killed". Complete or partial nest loss due to human activity has not "occurred frequently". Hatchling disorientation/disruption due to humans have not "occurred frequently". Direct hatchling mortality from human activity has not "frequently occurred".
19. Page 86-87 - Agree - NPS should adopt more proactive techniques used at other East Cost locations as referred to on pages 86-87: Captive Rearing, Routine Nest Relocation and Hatcheries.
20. Pages 392-396 - Disagree - NPS inadequately addresses that environmental issues are more detrimental to Turtle Recovery Success than ORVs or pedestrian.
21. Pages 270-281; 561-598 - Region of Influence (ROI) - Disagree - The ROI as defined in the DEIS incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. Inclusion of these areas significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the Seashore Villages. Analysis of economic impact on the Seashore Villages appears to be down played. The Economic analysis in the DEIS do not use data from the first full year of the Consent Decree (2009). Actual business survey data rather than model projections for economic impact for Seashore Villages businesses are not available in the DEIS.
22. Page 136 - "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during breeding season including in front of the villages, and establishment of breeding and nonbreeding SMAs would benefit the American oystercatcher." - Disagree - Current restrictions of pets on a 6 foot leash are sufficient. This regulation is too restrictive.

Correspondence ID: 12673 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:39:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep beach access open to ORV's and pedestrian traffic. As a fisherman and surfer, beach access is a critical component to my decision to frequent the Hatteras Island beaches. My family has been spending vacation time in Hatteras Village for 60 years. The very thought that the 2 percent "lawyered up" minority of bird watchers, Audobon and environmental nuts will dictate beach access for the 98 percent of all other interested parties who want free and open beach access is absurd!!!! If the park service restricts beach access on Hatteras Island, you will essentially be going against virtually every resident on Hatteras Island who will all be negatively impacted by your decision. Please do not place more importance on birds than people, for it will surely help to destroy the local economy and thus the livelihoods of all island residents. Please keep beach access open and develop a plan that will continue to allow the area to thrive economically. Thanks for your consideration. Todd Andrews

Correspondence ID: 12674 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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,

0012243

the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive >wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian >visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without >harming wilderness and wildlife resources. > >3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife >resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve >wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard >work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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, >Kevin Bauer

Correspondence ID: 12675 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:40:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: as a long time visitor (over 40 years) i think it is time to stop these illegal closers of the cape hatteras national seashore recreational area, to ORV traffic. none of these documents, the NPS is using as an excuses for closing the seashore to all visitors superseded, the original congressional intent of the congressional act establishing the recreational area.
i think all of the current arrogant NPS people, should be replaced with more public friendly NPS people.
there has been enough money wasted on these projects, that have not given any positive results.
it is past time to clean up the camp ground and return the recreation area to full public use.
there is absolutely no excuse of the way the public has been treated, the past five years.

Correspondence ID: 12676 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Fisher, Jonathan R
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation. Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 12677 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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, Eileen

Correspondence ID: 12678 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 13:45:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Murry,
As a frequent and long time visitor to the nations parks system, especially Cape Hatteras National Seashore I am deeply disturbed at some of the positions the NPS is proposing in the DEIS plan published on March 12 2010. I understand and agree with the NPS duties to protect and preserve our natural resources. My main area of concern is when in the protection of these resources the NPS over steps its bounds, and in the case of the CHNS, completely restricts the public to the point that this wonderful magnificent resource cannot be enjoyed by most citizens who wish to spend time there. My main issues of concern are as follows and I have several questions which I don't think you addressed in the original DEIS plan.
? I disagree with the restrictions (as proposed in Alternative "F" p. 97-101) of the ORV access between ramps 27 and 30 at the Hatteras Inlet, Ocracoke Inlet, and all other locations in the park. There must be a method to allow pedestrian and ORV access points to these areas without disturbing the natural

resources. ? I disagree with the severe restrictions (as proposed in Alternative "F" p. 104) not allowing night driving in the park. Over the past 40 years I have witnessed and enjoyed hundreds of sunsets and sunrises which cannot be viewed from any other areas in the park with the same majestic experience. These night closures would significantly reduce the time that the many fishermen can enjoy the resources at a time of day (during the PM hours) when the fishing can be the most productive and active. Given the right instruction on how to access these areas I know that all the individuals I have seen over the years could enjoy the park without disturbing the natural resource. ? I disagree with the prohibition of pedestrian access (as proposed in Alternative "F" p. 121) at the 8 different park locations from March 15 to July 31 each year. These locations have traditionally been available for all to enjoy. The removal of such large tracks of the park limits the overall positive experience that the park has to offer and significantly reduces ones desire to return to the seashore. ? I disagree with the drastic and large restrictions (as proposed in Alternative "F" p.121-127) put on the public's ability to access certain parts of the beach when a piping plover or American Oystercatcher nest or brood exists in the park. These closures of such large tracts of park lands makes enormous parts of the park non accessible by the public. There must be a common sense compromise which both protects the natural resource and does not prohibit pedestrian and ORV access to some of the most valued parts of the park to visit. ? I disagree with the NO PET restriction (as proposed in Alternative "F" p. 136) from March 15 to July 31. This restriction must be reconsidered with a more stringent enforcement of the current 6' leash rule, year round. Over the 40 years I have been enjoying CHNS my family and hundreds of park guests I have seen and obeyed the current pet rules with no damage to the natural resource. You must consider that too many individuals, the only important thing in their lives is their pets. These individuals treat their pets as one of their family and would treat the park with the same respect. I disagree with the restriction of public access with their pets in front of the many homes and businesses in the many towns that share, respect, and have been the primary caretakers of this area even before the NPS was there. I disagree and take real exception to the NPS analyses of the socio-economic impact of the actions taken in the DEIS and the negative drastic effect it will have on the region and the state of N.C. as stated on p. 270-286 , 561-598. For the NPS to state as they do on p. 383 that the local region will have to "adapt" to the new rules I find insulting to the hardworking people in the region who have nothing but the best interest of the park for their entire lives. I have seen the effects of what some of the types of restrictions imposed over the last couple of years by the Federal Court Consent Decree will do to the local region. The loss of business, jobs, homes, and the noticeable loss of tourism has all been a direct effect to the restrictions on park access. The NPS proposal in the DEIS, Alternative "F" is more restrictive then the Consent Decree and therefore could be more damaging then what's already in place. There are many alternatives used in our society to allow public use to coexist without disturbing our natural resources. Many of these approaches the NPS uses in other parks in the park system. In Alternative "F" of the DEIS plan the NPS is taking the more restrictive approach at the expense of the public use. There is no credible science to back up the NPS plan in Alternative "F" and a less restrictive approach must be taken to allow both public use and resource management of one of the nation's most valuable resource.

Correspondence ID: 12679 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Scheer, Julia
Received: May,10,2010 13:45:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am the owner of a small retail store on the Outer Banks of North Carolina. The closure of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore will and does directly effect my business. If people are not allowed access to these areas for sunbathing, fishing, walking etc. it will prevent them from coming down. It is also my understanding that when the private residents the originally owned this land granted it the the NPS part of the original agreement with them is this land would ALWAYS be open for public access and recreation. By closing this beach it would be in direct violation of this agreement. The protection of the Pipping Plover is not needed, the species in NOT endangered and it's numbers have been increasing in the last decade. While I do agree the nest may need protection, mankind can not prevent mother nature from running it's course, which is exactly what is trying to be done! KEEP OUR BEACHES OPEN FOR THE PUBLIC TO ENJOY!!!

Correspondence ID: 12680 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:46:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family and myself have been enjoying the OuTer Banks for 40+ years. We have always been aware of the beach birds and turtles and any other species that might be on the beaches. Closing the beaches from Bonner Bridge to Ocracoke will cause a tremendous amount of harm to businesses and the financial stability of the Outer Banks. The birds and turtles that frequent these beaches have always been watched over buy the people that use the beaches. The data that has been used is unsupported and no proof given that any of these birds are on any endangered list. The people that want to close the Outer Banks have no other interest than to close down communities, cause people and businesses to go broke and out of business and make the whole Outer Banks a "GHOST TOWN". I plead with you to listen and pay attention to the history of these communities and their people. Leave the Parks to the people and the Park Service to run this the way it has gotten along for years.
C. H. Craddock

Correspondence ID: 12681 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Date: May 10, 2010
To: National Park Service
From: Henry W Stumpf
Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments
I am a home owner in Avon N.C. and would like to include my comments concerning the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.
4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."
However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)
5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the

vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial

Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events.

Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules.

(p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about

1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 12682 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:48:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep these destructive, adolescent petrochemical machines out of our national parks, monuments, seashores, lakeshores and refuges. In this age of biodiversity collapse, we don't need more and more areas opened to these destructive machines. If people can't enjoy these areas in a restorative, non-paracitic manner, then they don't deserve to use the area.

Correspondence ID: 12683 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please accept this 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.
However, I have 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 and protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Sincerely, Greg Sherman

Correspondence ID: 12684 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:49:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12685 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:49:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12686 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:49:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12687 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:49:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12688 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:49:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12689 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:49:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12690 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:49:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12691 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:49:56

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: 12692 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:49:56

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: 12693 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:49:56

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: 12694 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:49:56

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: 12695 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:49:56
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.
*With so much shore habitat being lost in the Gulf, lets save what we can. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12696 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:49:56
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: 12697 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:49:56
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.

0012251

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12698 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:49:56
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: 12699 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:49:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Cars, buses, off road vehicles litter our lives, roads, and off road leaving us precious few quiet places to commune with nature. Please preserve Cape Hatteras and protect this natural national treasure from the pollution of all kinds from off road vehicles.

Correspondence ID: 12700 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12701 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:50:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12702 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

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

Correspondence ID: 12703 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

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

Correspondence ID: 12704 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:50:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12705 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12706 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 an avid ORV enthusiast, I believe that we need to place environmentally sensitive areas over the need for ORV areas. As one of the wealthiest nations, we need to preserve our precious resources. We do not need to be destructive to areas that need protection merely to have a place to play.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12707 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12708 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12709 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12710 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12711 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12712 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12713 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12714 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12715 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12716 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:18
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: 12717 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:18
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: 12718 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:18
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: 12719 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:18
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: 12720 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:18
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: 12721 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:18
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: 12722 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:18
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: 12723 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:19
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: 12724 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:20
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: 12725 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:29
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: 12726 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:29
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: 12727 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:29
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: 12728 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:30
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: 12729 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:30
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: 12730 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:30
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: 12731 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:30
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: 12732 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12733 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
I know of Cape Hatteras National Seashore and the lighthouse. It is a beautiful area and I am saddened to hear of the wildlife decline there. Please protect this valuable stretch of our nation's seashore, and the wild creatures that make it their home, especially birds and turtles. Areas should be made free of off-road vehicle use as these animals are sensitive to the noise, activity and pollution.
Please partner with scientists and environmentalists in developing a plan for the Seashore. Include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Provide more access for pedestrians, hikers and families observing and enjoying nature with minimal impact. Where animals and plants are not coming back as expected, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until the area recovers its previous natural state. Please don't heed to respond to Cape Hatteras' cries for recovery and management. Thank you very much for this opportunity to send in my comments.

Correspondence ID: 12734 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12735 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12736 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. I WOULD LIKE TO YOU TO SEE IF POPULATIONS REALLY CORRECT THEMSELVES OR LIVE IN GHETTOS BEFORE YOU BEGIN TO BLUDGEON OR SLAUGHTER A FEW OF THEM The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12737 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12738 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12739 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12740 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12741 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:50:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

Dear Superintendent Murray, Please help protect the birds and other animal life on Cape Hatteras by supporting legislation that's in the best interest of all of us, animal and human. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12742 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:50:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12743 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:50:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12744 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:50:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12745 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:50:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12746 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:50:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12747 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:50:50

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12748 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:50:56

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: 12749 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

Yesterday I saw my first pair of Piping Plovers at Waukegan Beach in IL. However, this beach has become unsuitable for nesting plovers due to heavy human useage. Shorebirds like these need protected habitat on beaches. I visit many sites in National Parks system, and am very happy to have some places off-limits to off-road vehicles.

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

Correspondence ID: 12750 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:50:56

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: 12751 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:50:56

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: 12752 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:50:56

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: 12753 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:50:57
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: 12754 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12755 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12756 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:51:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12757 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:51:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12758 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:51:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

I whole heartedly agree, that this beach, and all beaches.... all Federal and State parks/areas, should be for everyone.... not just one group. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12759 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12760 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12761 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12762 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12763 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12764 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should be the primary consideration, and any recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use throughout the year for wildlife activities, including breeding, migration, and species that winter over. Wildlife protection must be based on the best available scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers specified in the preferred plan are barely sufficient, and should be increased to provide adequate protection for breeding birds and sea turtles.

Furthermore, a specific plan must be developed to include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met.

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

Correspondence ID: 12765 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Unregulated beach-driving has taken its toll As a unit of the National Park system, Cape Hatteras has been required for decades under federal law to establish ORV guidelines that minimize harm to wildlife and natural values of the Seashore in accordance with the best available science. 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 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.

Correspondence ID: 12766 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12767 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:18
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: 12768 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:51:18

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: 12769 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:51:29

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: 12770 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:51:29

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: 12771 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:51:29

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: 12772 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:51:29

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: 12773 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

When I visited Cape Hatteras two years ago, I was shocked and saddened by the destruction of the beaches caused by ORV use on the beaches. Much of our coastline is open to development and uncontrolled habitat destruction. The preservation of habitat and serenity in National Seashore areas that can

be protected is of great importance.

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

If Alternative D is not chosen, the following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan:

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12774 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:30
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: 12775 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:30
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: 12776 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:30
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: 12777 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:30
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: 12778 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:30
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: 12779 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12780 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
As there will be such loss of our wildlife as a result of the oil spill in the Gulf, any opportunity to protect wildlife in other areas surely must be taken including support of the "environmentally preferred" Alternate D w ped access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12781 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
A personal note: ORVs do not belong on beaches or in any wild/undeveloped areas. Please keep them away from these beaches and ALL wild areas.
Thank you. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12782 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

Correspondence ID: 12783 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:51:38

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

Correspondence ID: 12784 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.----- WE NEED TO KEEP OUR NATIONAL PARKS "WILD FOREVER/FOREVER WILD", Its only pristine once.Do you folks think you can scrub the individual rocks clean like after the Exxon-Mobil Valdez incident? How about an once of prevention being worth a pound of cure? I ride too,but I want to be with nature when I HIKE,when I want to BIKE I BIKE.Just keep the damn parks natural for us AMERICANS who want their nature NATURAL,OKAY? Thanks for letting me rant at you, Bob Burke.

Correspondence ID: 12785 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12786 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12787 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12788 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12789 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12790 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12791 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:58
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: 12792 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:58
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: 12793 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:58
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: 12794 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:51:58

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: 12795 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:51:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12796 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:51:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12797 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12798 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:51:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12799 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12800 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12801 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12802 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12803 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:05
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: 12804 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:14
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: 12805 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:14
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: 12806 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

Dear Superintendent Murray,

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12807 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:52:14

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: 12808 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:52:14

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: 12809 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:14
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.
I am including the comment points supplied by the Audobon Society but would like to add that in light of the BP oil spill in the Gulf, it is urgent that we protect what refuges we have before they are destroyed beyond repair.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12810 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
Alternative D provides for more non-ORV use of beaches and less disturbance of wildlife. This should be the goal of seashore management.
As a pedestrian user of the national seashore and a citizen who values a healthy environment, I do NOT feel that ORVs are appropriate at all in a national seashore. They are destructive, polluting, and noisy, and they devalue the experience of natural setting. I do not feel they are compatible at all with the preservation of wildlife and the seashore environment. I would welcome their banishment totally from the park land. Having "fun" at the expense of and destruction of the seashore's creatures is simply wrong.
If you don't enact Alternative D, you should at least make half of the beach available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 follow this issue at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. Thank you for doing the right thing for the seashore entrusted to you.

Correspondence ID: 12811 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12812 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12813 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12814 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12815 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12816 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
Please protect the wildlife on the Cape Hatteras seashore and elsewhere. and STOP vehicle access. People can go anywhere but the animals who called the seashore home have no alternatives and their lives are being ended by allowing off road vehicles.
That is a way bigger tragedy than the inconvenience of going somewhere to enjoy a drive.

Correspondence ID: 12817 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:30
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: 12818 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:30
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.

0012291

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12819 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:30

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: 12820 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

* Put Natural Resources First. Both sea turtles and all wildlife, including threatened and endangered bird species should be the first priority of any plan adopted. It is imperative to preserve the quality of the shore ecology in order for all people to enjoy its unique properties. The NPS needs to step up now to protect species currently endangered and those not yet perceived as imperiled.

* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. this should be the top priority, stabilize current wildlife use then develop a plan to allow limited ORV use. The shore is being abused by those that have the largest machines. Please protect it for all living species, and all humans who love to experience a natural, national seashore.

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

Correspondence ID: 12821 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:30

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: 12822 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:30
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.
Remember that compassion is needed now more than ever for the animals of our planet.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12823 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
I love Hatteras and visit at least twice every year and I believe this alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches--faithful tourists like me -- and result in essential protections for wildlife, which I believe is a more important consideration than recreational enjoyments. Under the Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Pedestrians and families could then enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
Beach closures have NOT been detrimental to tourism and other local business, despite claims by the vocal opponents of closure. Very little of the beach has actually been off limits at any giving time; and according to the scientists monitoring the process, it has been very beneficial to the endangered wildlife that has a right to continue to live securely in its native habitat. The closure regulations are very reasonable in balancing recreation/tourism and needs of wildlife; participants from all sides contributed to the agreement. Please do not be swayed by the vocal, but unreasonable, arguments of the opponents of closure. It is not harmful to traditional ways of life for locals, it has not harmed business, and it has been essential to the birds' and turtles' survival.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I deeply love Cape Hatteras, and I sincerely believe that Hatteras can remain a safe refuge for an abundance of wildlife, which is a major reason I and many other tourists visit, AND local businesses can still continue to thrive.

Correspondence ID: 12824 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:30
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.
I am interested in an alternative plan which would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife. I see no reason that our water fronts should have vehicles on them. But rather that they should be safe places for both people and wildlife. There are plenty of places to drive. Roads to drive on. Driving on beaches is unsafe and I am totally opposed to it in all places and at all times. The park is a wonderful place that I visit often and ORV use is completely inconsistent with its beauty.
I am proud that my neighboring state of Virginia does not promote such activity and am strongly in support of its area on the North Carolina border to which no one can even drive a car. Hiking, biking, walking and tram access only.
We must protect our seashore and allow pedestrians and families the safely enjoy their time there while also enabling wildlife to have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
For a change, put Natural Resources FIRST. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and all recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering 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.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12825 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:52:32

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: 12826 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:52:36

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: 12827 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:52:36

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: 12828 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:52:36

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: 12829 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:52:36

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 would provide more opportunities for non-ORV uses of the beaches- in other words ,let the rest of us use the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife,

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12830 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:52:36

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: 12831 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12832 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12833 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12834 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12835 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
We do not need these ORV's running helter skelter all over the dunes. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12836 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12837 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12838 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12839 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

On a visit to Cape Hatteras with a group of wildlife enthusiasts, we were dismayed at the unregulated use of ORV's on the beach. Not only was it noisy and disruptive, it was very detrimental to any wildlife attempting to nest in this area.

Correspondence ID: 12840 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:47
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: 12841 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12842 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

Correspondence ID: 12843 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
Wildlife is extremely important to me, and I support a plan that would limit ORV use, add walkways and access that would encourage family/foot use and also give the Seashore wildlife a chance to rebound.
Our shores are precious, limited national resources, and as such they should be protected and preserved. ORV use is damaging in several ways; I would prefer to have it eliminated completely from this peaceful and unique area, but in any case its use should definitely be limited to less than half of the 68 miles of beach.
The recovery of birds, turtles, and plants should be a priority. ORV activities can take place in many other areas, but the flora and fauna of this area cannot be relocated.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12844 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12845 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12846 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am writing to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage off-road vehicle (ORV) use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore (CHNS). Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV use of the beaches and, most importantly, would result in fewer disturbances to the rare birds and sea turtles that use the beaches for nesting.

I am appalled and disappointed to see that under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be given preferential treatment and an unfair advantage and virtually free reign of the beaches. Alternative F would prohibit ORV use on only 16 of the 68 total miles of seashore beach! This is unfair and, to wildlife, unethical.

If ORV use is to be permitted at all in the park (and I prefer it be entirely prohibited), then at least half of the beach should be off limits to ORVs throughout the year. At least half of the beach should be available year-round for wildlife and non-ORV users. A much safer seashore environment would result, and endangered and rare birds and sea turtles would enjoy successful nesting seasons and a chance to rebound to traditional numbers and diversity.

We have a responsibility to protect and maintain the natural resources and wildlife diversity of CHNS and protecting it must be our priority.

Recreational use of the seashore needs to be secondary. Recreational use must be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan for CHNS fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for breeding, migrating, and wintering species of wildlife. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and must be increased in order to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. This is hugely important to me. The human race, with our ability to manipulate our environment, has managed to do more harm than any other species on the earth. We have extirpated countless numbers of species of plants and animals from this planet with our growth, development, and greed. I hope you will give this matter the serious attention it deserves, and I will be following the progress of your efforts and looking forward to seeing a final plan for Cape Hatteras that is fair and balanced and that will protect our wildlife and natural resources.

Correspondence ID: 12847 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12848 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:58
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: 12849 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

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

Correspondence ID: 12850 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:58
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: 12851 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:58
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.
 There's no need for off-road vehicles to use the seashore, but there is a need to preserve the seashore. Don't allow ORVs there.

Correspondence ID: 12852 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:58
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: 12853 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:58
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: 12854 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:58
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: 12855 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:52:58
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: 12856 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
I believe that ORV use should be regulated (but not outlawed) in the park. ALL of us use the parks, not just people who want to ride their vehicles. Keep an area open for ORV use, and limit ORVs to this area only so that the rest of the people can enjoy the park and the wildlife can continue to thrive. If ORV use is not limited and regulated, the rest of us will not have the right to view the park in its natural light. We have rights, too. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12857 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wuagon, Stanley S
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a home owner in Avon, NC I have always felt it was a privilege to have access to these beach areas you want to restrict our use of. I have always respected nature and wouldn't harm or disturb any wild life habitat, the area is large enough that both man and nature can co exist, and have been doing so up to this point.
In the long run the birds will go where they will and nature will survive but our fragile economy may not and we are so depended on our summer visitors to rent our homes and to support our economy.
The main reason I started to visit this wonderful place 19 years ago and eventually buying a home here is it was always restrictive in the local sea shore points in NJ and Delaware, I hope this isn't a prelude to what will be happening next. the birds may stay or keep migrate to other already areas of the island that are protected (Pea Island), for as long as I've been going to the Outer Banks ,it has been all good until now (why), but the Vacationers may not come back.
Regards,
Stan

Correspondence ID: 12858 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12859 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12860 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12861 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12862 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12863 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12864 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12865 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:10
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: 12866 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:10
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: 12867 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:10
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: 12868 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:10
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: 12869 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:10
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: 12870 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:10
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: 12871 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:10
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: 12872 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:10
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: 12873 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12874 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. Quiet to enjoy land and sea are essential for both wildlife and human well-being.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12875 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12876 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12877 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12878 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12879 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12880 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12881 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
If the National Park Service doesn't protect species that can not help themselves, then who will? Please keep ORV off of the National Seashore. No one NEEDs to drive on the beach. Wildlife NEEDs our help to survive. If someone really wants to drive on the beach, let them go to Daytona-it is already ruined. I love Cape Hatteras. Please enact the laws that will save this critical habitat and wonder of God.
Thank You,
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12882 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:20
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: 12883 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:20
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: 12884 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:20
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: 12885 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:20
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: 12886 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:20
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 very important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you very much for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be closely following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and greatly look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12887 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:20
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: 12888 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Redmond, John
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a serious saltwater angler of the East Coast, and someone that is representative of thousands of northeast anglers that want to keep Fishing & Beach Access Open.
I am against 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 storied American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ?which is visited by countless thousands of fellow visiting anglers. This fishing ? our reason for coming to NC ? is accessible only by over sand vehicle.
Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.
In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community.
Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me and the countless other anglers from all parts of the US that VISIT North Carolina, as well as the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing (and us TOURISTS), 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.
Best regards and Please Keep Access Open,
John Redmond Owner, Chief Cook & Bottlwasher www.Striped-Bass.com

Correspondence ID: 12889 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:53:25
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: 12890 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:53:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

Correspondence ID: 12891 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:53:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

Correspondence ID: 12892 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:53:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12893 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:53:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12894 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:53:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

ORV's are dangerous to humans as well as wildlife. They also damage habitat and cause pollution. The selfish ORV owners should not be allowed to wreak havoc on Cape Hatteras National Seashore or other federally owned lands.

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

Correspondence ID: 12895 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12896 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:31
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: 12897 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:31
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: 12898 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:31
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: 12899 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:31
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: 12900 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:31
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
Thank you for what you have done to protect the waterbird and turtle habitats so far. Lets make this a place for all of us.

Correspondence ID: 12901 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:31
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.
I use the beaches of the Seashore several times a year for bird-watching, photography, and simply for walking. While I generally do not mind sharing the beaches with ORVs, I feel that it is important to maintain the Seashore habitat in a way that produces as little disturbance to wildlife, plants and animals, as possible. Therefore, I would prefer to see the closure of some beach areas to ORV disturbance during critical times of the year.
The current preferred plan does not provide adequate protection for wildlife. Nor does it provide the lack of disturbance many species need to build up their population numbers to sustainable levels. These organisms are not just pretty to look at. The health of their populations is an indicator of the health of the whole ecosystem along the Outer Banks.
I would prefer to see the development of a plan that allows for the sharing of the Seashore by wildlife, pedestrians, and ORV drivers. If this results in restricting human access, either pedestrian or vehicular, at certain times of the year, I strongly support that decision.
Sincerely yours, Norman Budnitz 4115 Garrett Dr Durham, NC, 27705

Correspondence ID: 12902 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:31
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: 12903 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:31
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: 12904 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:36
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: 12905 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:53:36

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: 12906 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:53:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12907 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:53:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12908 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12909 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12910 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12911 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. We are smart enough to figure these things out if we were not so greedy. We need to think of the overall good for the environment in accomodating change or disruption to the ecology.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12912 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12913 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

me.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12914 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12915 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12916 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to

me.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12917 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12918 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
This is not an unreasonable request considering that the natural beauty of these beaches is the ultimate source of value for this area, including tourism.

Correspondence ID: 12919 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. The wildlife on the outer banks need all of the help and protection possible. They have no one else to defend and protect them.

Very Sincerely,

Ann Graves 814 Guilford College Road, #192 Greensboro, NC 27409

Correspondence ID: 12920 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
I am very concerned that in the preferred plan the ORV users are getting too much access, at the cost of wildlife. Natural Resources must be protected first. Access to the beach must be worked around the needs of species that need the beach for breeding. Buffers must be based on scientific research.
The alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which is vitally important to me.
Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12921 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:47
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: 12922 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:47
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: 12923 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
As a 76 year old woman, I have had a life long love of our natural wild areas and our wildlife. It is critical that our wildlife be protected from human activities that destroy the wild creatures, birds and animals. There is no reason that anyone should have the right to drive off road vehicles onto beach areas where wild birds are nesting. This is simply wrong. These people need to be a lot more respectful of our natural wonders and not allowed to destroy them for the rest of our society.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12924 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
Preserving the natural beauty and health of the wildlife at Cape Hatteras contributes to the enjoyment to ORV and non-ORV visitors. I am concerned that some of the proposals under consideration would compromise the serenity and ongoing health of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me and many others.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. Cape Hatteras National Seashore hinges on this principle. Ultimately, the ongoing appear of theThe preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Correspondence ID: 12925 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

I believe we should maintain Cape Hatteras National Seashore as near as possible to its original state, which is most likely possible following plans of the "environmentally preferred" Alternative D.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12926 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:47
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: 12927 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:47
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.

ORV users are basically very disruptive users and do incredibly more damage and disturbance than any other type of user, therefore much more weight should be given to less disruptive users than ORV's.

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12928 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:47
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: 12929 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:47
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: 12930 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:47
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.

0012328

Correspondence ID: 12931 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:53:52

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12932 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

Ideally, I prefer a complete ban on off road vehicle use in our protected areas. I visit these areas to enjoy the natural beauty and wildlife of this unique area. I care deeply that it should be preserved so my children have the opportunity to experience a small part of our country that remains unspoiled.

When it is allowed to become a parking lot, it destroys the value most visitors travel to experience. My experience is ruined by this traffic on the beach and the opportunity to view wildlife greatly diminished. However, in spirit of compromise, this alternative plan (D) is a more fair solution.

This alternative 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 we cannot protect a national seashore, what can be protected?

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12933 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 13:53:53

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12934 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12935 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12936 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

Correspondence ID: 12937 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12938 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:58
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: 12939 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:58
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: 12940 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:58
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: 12941 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12942 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

Correspondence ID: 12943 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12944 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:53:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12945 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:54:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife. ORV users should not be on the National Seashore!
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

Correspondence ID: 12946 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:54:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12947 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:54:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12948 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:54:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
Here in Ventura County, for instance, the Snowy Plover breeding grounds on the beach are protected with taped off areas, volunteer guards, and signs to educate the public. Education is key to combat the pervasive marketing mantra "It's all about me." Such actions are necessary--and supported by the public when understood--to protect the fragile existence of our plant's wildlife.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a final plan that protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Sincerely,
Ms. Carol Summers 78 N. Joanne Avenue Ventura, CA 93003

Correspondence ID: 12949 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:54:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12950 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

We are guardians of the precious wildlife and habitats. They cannot defend themselves against human encroachment. I love seeing birds and animals in their natural habitat so much more than in captivity. Knowing that species can continue means much to me, insofar as they can sustain themselves free from predatory behavior by humans. All we need to do to sustain them is to protect their homes adequately. In so doing, we maintain beauty and order in the world for future generations. This cannot be done by doing only the minimum sustainability level, it must be done as generously and as selflessly as our own survival can manage. You are in the position to make these decisions. It is a great and necessary responsibility.

Correspondence ID: 12951 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:54:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12952 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12953 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 13:54:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 12954 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.

Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.

Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.

The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 12955 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Smallwood, Don C
Received: May,10,2010 13:56:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 May 10, 2010
Re: Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Draft Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/EIS
Dear Mr. Murray:
This letter is sent to you as a public comment under your draft EIS referred to above. Though most of it is copied from a friend's letter to you, that I feel was very well written, it indeed reflects my feelings on this matter quite accurately.
I, along with my 2 children, are frequent visitors to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I "discovered" Cape Hatteras in 1982. I now spend nearly half

of my year in the area and the other half in an equally special place- South Hero Vermont (which is also an island). We have participated in all but three of the activities cited in the Figure 23 Visitor Activity Survey Results (Page 260). We would like to continue enjoying the recreation at the seashore for the remainder of our years, however I am gravely concerned that the preferred proposed Alternative F will severely impede this. As stated in the Act, Congress established the Seashore in 1937 as a national seashore for the enjoyment and benefit of the people, and to preserve the area. (page iv). Although I agree with the premise of protecting the natural resource, Alternative F would do so at the expense of humans, as well as the local economy and culture. .

Specifically my comments on the proposed plan:

- 1) I disagree: Page 121. To completely prohibit pedestrian access in sections of the national seashore, runs completely contrary to the basis upon which the Park was founded, for recreation. Pre-Nesting Closures All species: All designated Breeding Shorebird SMAs will be posted as pre-nesting closures using symbolic fencing by Mar 15 at sites involving piping plover, Wilson's plover, and/or American oystercatcher; and by Apr 15 at sites involving only colonial waterbirds. The NPS will determine the configuration of specific pre-nesting closures based on an annual habitat assessment. Pre-nesting closures would be adjusted to the configuration of the Nonbreeding Shorebird SMAs for the respective sites (as described later in this table) if no breeding activity is seen in the area by Jul 31, or 2 weeks after all chicks have fledged, whichever comes later. Pre-nesting closures will not be modified in cases where the beach erodes into the buffered habitat. ORVs, pedestrians, and pets are prohibited within all resource closures, including pre-nesting closures. ML1: SMAs managed using ML1 measures would not allow ORV or pedestrian access when pre-nesting closures are in effect. ML2: The Bodie Island Spit, Cape Point, and South Point Ocracoke SMAs would be managed using ML2 measures in action alternatives C, E, and F. Once pre-nesting closures are implemented at these sites, a narrow ORV access corridor (where ORV use is permitted) or a pedestrian access corridor (where ORV use is not permitted) would be established. Upon the first observation of breeding activity, the standard buffers (please refer to table 11, Shorebird/Waterbird Buffer Summary) will apply, which depending upon the circumstances may close the access corridor. The Bodie Island Spit access corridor would follow the ocean shoreline to the inlet. The Cape Point access corridor would follow the ocean shoreline from ramp 44 south to the point, then west approximately 0.2 mile along the ocean shoreline. The South Point Ocracoke access corridor would follow the ocean shoreline south from ramp 72 to the inlet. Exact configuration of the corridor would be determined by NPS staff based on the annual habitat assessment. The ORV access corridor at ML2 sites will generally be no more than 50 meters wide above the high tide line (alternative E may include a designated pass-through zone where no stopping or recreation would be permitted in order to minimize disturbance). An ML2 pedestrian access corridor would generally be below the high tide line and would in no case be more than 10 meters above the high tide line. Pets, as well as kite flying, ball and Frisbee tossing, and similar activities, will be prohibited in the access corridors or pass-through zones (in alternative E only) while the pre-nesting closure is in effect.
- 2) I disagree. I find the proposed 1000 meter buffers cited on pages 121 ? 127 unnecessarily restrictive and arbitrary. The use of such large buffers will cause people to be forced into smaller areas, with a subsequent greater impact on resource in the area. In addition, the expansion of the buffers as a punitive measure for infractions is also arbitrary. Please do not punish all for the offenses of one.
- 3) I disagree. The complete prohibition of ORVs, year round, pp 97-101, is entirely unnecessary, and will also impede human ability to partake of many recreational activities in the stated areas between ramps 27-30, Hatteras Spit, Ocracoke Inlet and others.
- 4) I disagree. Pets have been part of my, and continue to be part of many visitors' recreation and vacation experience. I disagree with the proposal to completely prohibit pets at the seashore beaches during "breeding season" from March 15th to July 31st. Page 136. Pets on a leash will not interfere with wildlife protection measures.
- 5) I disagree. It has not been proven scientifically that human interference is extensively responsible for damage to turtles and nesting birds, (less than 3%) so the prohibition against night driving for over half of the year is unnecessarily restrictive. P 104, P 377. No piping plover deaths have been attributable to ORVs.
- 6) Page 468, I disagree. Access should be provided through all species management areas. Buffers should move with the species, instead of being expanded.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed plan. I look forward to a reasonable resolution of the issues, one that the Park, the Visitors, the natural Resources and the Local Culture and Economy will find reasonable and sustainable.

Sincerely,
Don Smallwood

Correspondence ID:	12956	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>The Coastal Conservation Association North Carolina wishes to comment on the recently released Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the ORV Management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area issued by the National Park Service. The objective of CCA is to conserve, promote and enhance the present and future availability of these coastal resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the general public. As such the thousands of members and volunteers of CCA NC and their nearly three quarters of a million associated recreational anglers are very disappointed in the six options for ORV management on CHNSRA. First of all the document itself is very difficult to follow in its 800+ pages. The tragedy is that none of the six options reflect the wishes of the vast majority of the CHNSRA visiting public and CCA NC. While there are preferred environmental and NPS options, there is no pro-access preferred option. The CHNSRA was established specifically for the American public to enjoy the seashore. To propose no option which provides a maximum access option certainly violates the spirit and perhaps the letter of the laws establishing this national park. Without serving the visiting public, The NPS has failed in its responsibility to our citizens. All the options presented in the DEIS seek to restrict public access well beyond any reasonable or legal requirement.</p> <p><!--[if !supportEmptyParas]--> <!--[endif]--></p> <p>It is clear that significant facts have been ignored in the preparation of this DEIS. The success of turtle nesting and piping plover nesting and fledging is virtually unchanged since the de facto ORV plan was implemented in 1978. The primary causes of failed nesting and fledging are overwhelmingly predation and weather events which have occurred for hundreds of years. ORV caused mortality is a fraction of 1%. The USFWS and NPS personnel have caused more plover mortality. Yet, the NPS chooses to attack those users who are very sensitive to the wildlife in the CHNSRA.</p> <p>The DEIS options all include restrictions which, when implemented as they have been under the consent decree, will unnecessarily close miles and miles of beach access both from the ocean and sound side. The many options describe no action which can circumvent a nesting closure in order to access an open area of the beach. Thus, while a stretch of waterfront may be "open" it is inaccessible. This represents nothing more than verbal trickery and masks the true available waterfront.</p> <p>The specifics of option F, the NPS preferred option, require at least some comment as commenting on all options would extend beyond the available space and time constraints. Overall, the DEIS suggests there would be 52 of 68 miles of the waterfront "open" to ORV access but it is not clear that this includes any calculation of sound side access for ORVs or pedestrians. CCA NC strongly believes the "buffer" or closure areas suggested for piping plovers in various stages of nesting and fledging are beyond excessive. For nesting piping plovers 50 meters is more than adequate and as is 200 meters for unfledged chicks. To suggest that unfledged chicks of a bird that is less than 1 foot tall requires over a mile of seashore is ludicrous! All this with no pass through or corridor around these areas closes vast areas of the CHNSRA to the American public. All other shore birds should be allocated no more than 30m for nesting and 30m for unfledged chicks with pass through corridors as there is no legal requirement to provide excessive buffers. In addition, the NPS fails to recognize the role played by the spoil islands behind Bodie Island, Hatteras Island, Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge and Ocracoke Island in the breeding of shore birds. These areas are typically with a few hundred yards of the CHNSRA and harbor large populations of shore birds. If the NPS truly wants to help the population of piping plovers they should investigate the usage of large cages placed around the nests to keep predators out of the nests. These are used in the Northeast where the major piping plover nesting takes place. The NPS and the USFWS seem content to kill hundreds of other wildlife to try to protect piping plovers but refuse to implement simpler techniques improve shore bird breeding success while improving access as well.</p> <p>Option F describes measures required to "improve turtle breeding success". Many of the restrictions described in option F have little basis in peer reviewed science. For example, there is no evidence that night driving of ORVs has any impact on turtle nesting or hatchling survival. There have been</p>						

no female turtles killed by ORVs. To protect turtle nests and improve hatchling success, CCA NC recommends relocation of turtle nests when they are laid in areas exposed to weather events. Using the fences used on the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge that are keyhole shaped are more effective for turtle hatchlings and would allow continued use of ORVs at night.

The surf zone of CHNSRA has been used for a hundred years for the purposes of swimming, sunbathing, fishing, birding and shelling. ORV usage is critical to the pursuit of these activities as much of the surf zone would be inaccessible without ORVs. The NPS, throughout the DEIS, seeks only to restrict ORV usage without proposing ways to improve access for ORVs and providing expanded habitat for those species which are threatened or endangered. It seems the NPS has forgotten the CHNSRA was established as a recreation area. Pea Island National Wildlife Sanctuary is for wildlife, yet under the de facto rules in place from 1978, there has been little difference in the successful breeding of piping plovers or endangered sea turtles. CCA NC urges you to revert to those rules put in place in 1978 to provide maximum access for ORVs and the American citizens.

Correspondence ID: 12957 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Overstreet, Annette S
Received: May,10,2010 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,
Annette S. Overstreet

Correspondence ID: 12958 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gupta, Sam K
Received: May,10,2010 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, and not to permit ORV use on a widespread scale. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 12959 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Sturdevant, Michael
Received: May,10,2010 14:01:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We visit the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area and would like to continue to recreate there. The legislation for the Recreational Area states, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Please balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.
To that end, corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. Buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given an unprecedented level of protection in Alternative F. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.
Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to Endangered Species Act protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.
The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success.

More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.
Sincerely, Michael Sturdevant

Correspondence ID: 12960 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:02:27
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: 12961 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Groom, Pete G
Received: May,10,2010 14:03:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to Alternative F and support the Coalition for Beach Access Position, with respect to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area Off-Road Vehicle management plan/ Environmental Impact Statement Draft. 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, Pete Groom

Correspondence ID: 12962 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Giannotti, Nancy C
Received: May,10,2010 14:04:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I agree that protection of the birds is very important. I disagree that the degree that they are protected is to the extreme. In the Park Service preferred Alternative F plan you are protecting the Oystercatcher with a full beach closers. Even Gordon Myers the Executive Director of N.C. Wildlife Resources Commission claims that this practice is beyond the intent of N.C. which you are using as a guide.

Correspondence ID: 12963 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:04:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: OUR FAMILY HAS ENJOYED VACATIONING IN THE OUTER BANKS FOR MANY YEARS. NOW OUR GRANDCHILDREN ARE BEGINNING TO SHARE OUR LOVE FOR THE BEACH. WE ARE VERY CONCERNED THAT THIS TREASURE WILL NO LONGER BE AVAILABLE FOR THEM AND THEIR CHILDREN. EVERYTIME WE GO TO THE BEACH WE TRY TO LEAVE IT AS CLEAN OR CLEANER THEN BEFORE. THE WILD LIFE ALSO IS VERY RESPECTED AND WE WOULD NEVER DO ANYTHING TO HARM THEM. CLOSING BEACH ACCESS WOULD FORCE US TO VACATION SOMEWHERE ELSE. PLEASE BE FAIR AND RESPECT OUR RIGHTS TO OUR NATIONAL SEASHORE. SINCERELY JOANN CLARK PINE HILL NEW JERSEY

Correspondence ID: 12964 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:05:19
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: 12965 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hoch, Lisa
Received: May,10,2010 14:05:46
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: 12966 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kassan, Lawrence
Received: May,10,2010 14:06:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't trash our beautiful seashore with more roads and gasoline off-road vehicles.

Correspondence ID: 12967 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Date: May 10, 2010 To: National Park Service From: Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments
My comments are below and are clearly a collective set of ideas common to property owners in Avon. Before the technical I must preface with the following. A National Seashore is a PARK.
Please take a moment to look back to the reason the park was created. The then Secretary of the Interior said
"When we look up and down the ocean fronts of America, we find that everywhere they are passing behind the fences of private ownership. The people can no longer get to the ocean. When we have reached the point that a nation of 125 million people cannot set foot upon the thousands of miles of beaches that border the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, except by permission of those who monopolize the ocean front, then I say it is the prerogative and the duty of the Federal and State Governments to step in and acquire, not a swimming beach here and there, but solid blocks of ocean front hundreds of miles in length. Call this ocean front a national park, or a national seashore, or a state park or anything you please?I say that the people have a right to a fair share of it."
Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, 1938
There is no mention that birds have more rights than Americans. To be sure the lobbying efforts of some conservation groups are well funded and influential. To be sure the property owners have dwindling rights that have little organized advocacy. Should beach goers and property owners who have risked financial resources to provide comfortable places to stay for those folks for whom the park was intended have their interests set aside because there is no BEACH USER LOBBY? I truly believe that the Park Service has been put in the position of forging a solution that is to remedy a problem that has already been given a priority. The priority is not to accede to the wishes of a few but to find away to allow all to use the resources Americans have paid for. The proposed solutions do not accomplish that. The following is the detail behind how I feel it falls short.
"Call this ocean front a national park, or a national seashore, or a state park or anything you please?I say that the people have a right to a fair share of it."
Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, 1938
My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas. 2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.
4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."
However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)
5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.
Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.
6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The

proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%.

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

As a lifelong resident of Hatteras Island, we of the Hatteras Island community have always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement. I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended. Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial. Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts. Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty. Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection. 16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be

prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area. Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates. 18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas. Conclusion: Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed. It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date. The USFS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit." Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 12968 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Raynes, Michael
Received: May,10,2010 14:07:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The drastic reduction in beach access on Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a travesty of justice when one looks at the scientific research, or lack thereof, as well as the economic impact it has had. It is very possible to protect all species and at the same time revert to the level of beach access prior to the "consent decree". For example there is no evidence that night driving in the recreational areas has done any damage to turtle nestings. Weather conditions have had a far more negative impact on resource protection than any man made activity. When determining the economic impact, one should look just at Hatteras Island and not lump all of the outer banks from Corolla south. Many people will not vacation again on Hatteras Island if their favorite beach access points are closed. This will have a tremendous negative impact on the local economy in a time when the whole nation is suffering in a recession. I urge the NPS to open up the beaches to the level once enjoyed by all visitors and residents. Employ smaller buffers for threatened species and only monitor other non-threatened species.

Correspondence ID: 12969 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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,
Patricia Osdoby

Correspondence ID: 12970 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Date: May 10, 2010
To: National Park Service
From: Barbara Ledda
Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments
My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]. No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: Carrying capacity would be a peak use limitdetermined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfrontIf you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative F. I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor

statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15 4) Page 1: I agree with your statement ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors.

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CANT get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two buffered ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial

Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%.

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! Its insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement protect and preserve natural and cultural resources appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a negligible to moderate adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to adapt to the new rules.

(p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance

of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages. = No Pets in public areas beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 July 31. I have a rental house that books approximately 26 rental weeks per year between April 1- December 1. All my rentals bring their pets. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation home. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Lets scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the publics right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying Protect, not Prohibit.

Thank you,
Barbara Ledda

Correspondence ID: 12971 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Mortimer, Mary L
Received: May,10,2010 14:09:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

In regards to the DEIS management plan, as an individual who enjoys Cape Hatteras, I have the following comments:

1) Buffer proposed for the Piping Plover: I strongly disagree with the proposed buffer of 1000 meters, or 2/3 of a mile. In many locations, the road itself is less than 200 meters from the beach - providing a huge linear buffer along the beach, but ignoring the road nearby appears to provide a false sense of protection. A corridor of 200 meters or less has been used at other sites. For example, in the Natural Resource Conservation Service, buffers for piping plover at Apple Creek Watersheds is a minimum of 200 feet or 60 meters. In the Mass. Audobon Society pamphlet, they indicate a 50 meter buffer, with a 200 meter buffer for kite flying only.

2) I question the purpose of having a longer closure for the South facing beaches. This will have an effect on the economy in this region.

3) I question providing buffers for non-endangered birds. In addition, if a bird is removed from the endangered species list, the buffers should also be removed.

4) In generally, I believe there should be some sort of exception which allows at least 50% of the beaches in each area of the island to remain open to either ORV or pedestrian traffic at all times. To achieve this, some nests may need to be moved. The Cape Hatteras National Recreation Center was set up for recreation, not simply a bird sanctuary.

I believe there has to be a median to which adequate protection can be provided for the wildlife and adequate access is provided to the guests and visitors. Hopefully, by incorporating some of the many comments, the result will be something we all can live with.

Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 12972 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 14:10:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.

Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources.

Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.

Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.

The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 12973 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 14:10:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I HAVE ALWAYS CONSIDERED MYSELF AN ENVIRONMENTALIST- IN FACT I HAVE BEEN (UNTIL THIS LAWSUIT OVER BEACH ACCESS) A LONGSTANDING MEMBER OF THE AUDUBON SOCIETY AND DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE. LET ME STATE FOR THE RECORD THAT I BELIEVE THAT SEA TURTLES AND SHOREBIRDS SHOULD BE PROTECTED AND SEVERE PENALTIES SHOULD BE LEVIED AGAINST ANYONE WHO WILLFULLY HARMS A NEST, BIRD, TURTLE OR ANY OTHER CRITTER ON OUR NATIONAL SEASHORE. THAT SAID I BELIEVE THE BEACH CLOSURES OF 2009 WERE NOT FAIR AND THAT A MORE EQUITABLE COMPROMISE CAN BE REACHED IN 2010. ORV's AND THE SUNBATHERS, FISHERMAN AND YES, BIRDWATCHERS CAN LIVE WITH SOME RESTRICTIONS ON ACCESS WHEN NEST ARE DOCUMENTED BUT THE BEACH CLOSURE LAST YEAR WAS PURE OVERKILL. THE PEOPLE OF HATTERAS ISLAND WHO MAKE THEIR LIVING FROM TOURIST AND OTHERS DRAWN TO THE ISLAND'S BEACHES NEED TO BE PROTECTED AS WELL. I BELIEVE BETTER WAYS TO KEEP AS MUCH BEACH AS POSSIBLE OPEN TO OFFROAD VEHICLES CAN BE WORKED OUT AND STILL PROTECT WILDLIFE IF THE PARK SERVICES GET THE MINDSET THAT CHNS IS FOR ALL AMERICANS AND VISITORS TO ENJOY WHAT GOD CREATED.

Correspondence ID: 12974 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Ray, Jefferson
Received: May,10,2010 14:15:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The DEIS for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is completely biased and invalid as a resource for making decisions regarding resource protection and recreational access. Those who participated in it's formulation should be fired. It ignores the truth about the resource. The truth is that ORV's are a very small part of the problem when it comes to turtle and nesting bird recovery and proliferation. It ignores predation and weather/ocean overwash as the primary reasons why the birds and turtles do not survive.
I followed the farce that was the Negotiated Rule Making. It was a complete failure and the fact that the DEIS supposedly came from that process is a lie.
I find it highly disturbing (and proof that integrity is not important to the NPS) that the NPS places such a high priority on the species of concern list generated by North Carolina while the state does not. The American Oystercatcher is not endangered nor is it designated as threatened by the federal government. Why does NPS need to close the beach to protect it? It does not fall under the jurisdiction of the ESA. Why does the NPS get to IGNORE science and close the beach for this bird when it is not even listed as endangered or even recognized by the federal government as threatened? They do this because they have a political agenda and they can ignore science and the facts because there is no one to hold them accountable for the damage they do to the local economy and the local population's devotion to protecting this resource.
Both the NC Wildlife Resources Commission and the NC Marine Fisheries Commission support the access point of view. If the NPS had any desire to represent the local human population, the local bird and turtle population, and to protect the Seashore, they would listen to the science and not to the special interests which the NPS currently serves.
My recommendations are:
To throw the DEIS in the trash and admit that it is a political document which was written to serve the interests of special interest groups whose agenda is to deny access even if it means circumventing the law as it was written. The NPS should admit that predation, storms and interference by outside monitors are the real reasons for the lack of birding success in the CHNRA.
To admit that the closures offered by Alt. F are ridiculous and have no basis in scientific study. Alternative F is a horrible alternative. I work with children and adults who have special needs and every bit of what is offered by NPS in terms of beach closures is disrespeptful to those who have special cognitive or mobility needs. The DEIS and the NPS have no respect for humans with special needs who have a right to the same access as other humans and birds.
To change the thinking of the NPS that ORV's are not the problem. A government agency should not be allowed to customize science to fit their agenda. Their agenda should be driven by science, economic impacts and the input of the local community. And not controlled by a few special interest groups who have no desire to protect the CHNRA but rather just ban access to the beach.
Sincerely,
Jefferson Ray Coinjock, NC

Correspondence ID: 12975 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: windsor, Doanld
Received: May,10,2010 14:19:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: May 8, 2010
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27952
Dear Mr. Murray:
I believe in preserving and protecting life on the Cape Hatteras Recreational Seashore Park, but I do not agree with the NPS DEIS's (pg 270-281; 561-698) representation of the economical impact on this Island.
I am in the construction industry, and there has been a decline the amount of work available because of the decline in the building. To subsidize my income,I learned additional trade. This job (pools and hot tubs) has now had a decrease in work secondary to a decline in the number of tourists renting homes, because of decreased access to the beaches.
At the same time I stugle to make my mortgage paymens, the value of my home has decreased. (yet, my taxes and my insurance have gone up???)
Therefore, I disagree with the with the NPS DEIS representation of the economical impact on this Island. I also disagree with the studies grouping haeras Island with the northern island.
I hope that these comments will be considered, as I hope to continue to be able to provide for my livlehood on Hatteras Island.
Sincerely, Don Windsor

Correspondence ID: 12976 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kieffer, Ramsay
Received: May,10,2010 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, Ramsay Kieffer

Correspondence ID: 12977 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:19:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12978 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until 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 an avid ORV rider, I want to see protections put in place for all concerned-plants, animals and people. I do enjoy riding whenever possible, but I also stay the trails, so as not to disturb the ecosystems in the areas. If everyone who rides would think this way, life would be much easier!
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12979 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:19:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. Let me close with a comment made by an anonymous sage: "Hell must be a place without birds."

Correspondence ID: 12980 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:19:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12981 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:19:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
I believe that the off road beach driving despoils the very things that attract people to the beach in the first place.. The beachfront sand and dunes should be for foot traffic only. They should not be used for "cruising". People who want to move down the coast for fishing or alternative scenery should use the back of dune roads, or the paved highway. ATV's are particularly damaging, especially when operated by unsupervised teenagers.
Save the beach for the natural beauty and wildlife, not for four wheeling and partying. If people come for recreation, then they should get out and walk.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 12982 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:19:56
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: 12983 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:24:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.
Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.
Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.
The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 12984 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:24:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: PLEASE KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF THE PUBLIC LAND THAT IS OWNED BY THE TAXPAYERS WHICH IF YOU DID NOT KNOW IS ALL THE ATV RIDERS THAT THE TRAILS THIS YEARS ELECTIONS WILL TELL YOU A LOT ABOUT WHAT IS GOING ON WITH THIS TYPE OF NONSENSE NEW ELECTED PEOPLE WILL MAKE THE CHANGES NECESSARY TO STOP THIS WHAT YOU PEOPLE ARE TRYING TO DO TO WE THE PEOPLE
SINCERELY
PAUL BUCHKOVICH

Correspondence ID: 12985 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Groom, Donna G
Received: May,10,2010 14:26:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not understand the necessity for such restrictive measures as proposed in Alternative F. I support the Coalition for Beach access proposal. After years of watching the NPS I realize that this matter is just the concern "du jour". The NPS makes its determination based upon the prevailing tide and then bends like a willow in the following onslaught. How else could we look at past NPS practice:
Extermination of Canadian Geese because of the success of it's previous protective programs. Hunting season for deer on Nat'l Park Svc, property previously treated as natural preserves. Trapping of native species, such as racoon, possum and feral cats, because the park service would prefer to protect species it considers endangered. Listening to so called experts who do nothing on a daily basis other than complain about things. Where are these experts when I pick up cruise line balloons off the beach? Where are these experts when container ships break apart and our beaches are covered with packing foam? Where are these experts when assistance is required to sit by turtle nests to insure the hatchlings safe passage to the surf? Where are these experts after storms when we, the islanders, rescue injured birds and animals on the beaches?
Money talks and the NPS has sold out to high priced attorneys and environmental defense funds. Attorneys and judges whom very likely have not walked on our beaches now hold our future in their hands. I believe I am wasting my time in writing but for the sake of doing something before this travesty takes place, I'll waste my time. Do the right thing instead of rushing our heritage and future to it's early grave.

Correspondence ID: 12986 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Date: May 10, 2010
To: National Park Service
From: Timothy J Cantwell
Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments
My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.
4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."
However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)
5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the

vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial

Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "?prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests

to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Sincerely, Mary E. Cantwell,MD

Correspondence ID: 12987 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:26:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Keep off road vehicles off the beaches of Cape Hatteras!

Correspondence ID: 12988 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Heath, James C
Received: May,10,2010 14:28:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I've been selling furniture and patio furniture stores in the Southeast US since 1980. I own a furniture rep business. On the coast, I have covered stores in the states of NC, SC, GA, and FL during that time. My speciality is outdoor furniture. I grew up in Jacksonville NC and have been a avid waterman most of my life. If you really understood the different coastal areas you would know development has been key to growth during the past 35 years. Everywhere on the coast where I travel development either condo, second home or commercial has all but completely changes the landscape. It's a shame. Not what I grew up with. Stopping more development of homes is a positive for beach access. That is done. Don't stop the people. It has been people who made the area. Respect what few freedoms are left. Find a compromise for people and birds. Make it so everyone and thing enjoys beach access.

Correspondence ID: 12989 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:29:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a resident and business owner on Hatteras Island. I am writing in reference to the proposed beach closings on Hatteras Island and Ocracoke Islands. I disagree with the socio-economic data and analyses of alternative "F". The findings are incomplete and flawed. The result is an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the island. I own a clothing store and my family and I depend on tourism to survive. The economical impact of the beach closings would have a devastating effect on my family, and the families of all the residents of the island. The primary reason that tourist come to our island is for the beautiful beaches. If the beaches become something they can no longer enjoy, they will choose other vacation destinations. That would take money out of the coffers of my store, Dare County and, maybe even the state of North Carolina. I disagree that any piping plover unfledged chick brood requires 1,000 meter closure in all directions. This has not been based on any scientific findings. Seven hundred and seventy-one acres per brood seems excessive, and is completely unsupported by research. Furthermore, the plan calls for 300 meters in all directions for American Oystercatchers, which are not a federally threatened species. Before we devastate our economy and ruin the lives of the residents of the island, I think it would be prudent to call for research into what the birds actually need to prosper. Also, the alternative "F", aims to protect sea turtles. Hatteras Island has the largest closures with the lowest production of sea turtles of any beach in the US. In Florida, turtle production is higher, yet they do not have huge fines and closures protecting the nests. In places other than Cape Hatteras National Seashore, nests are routinely relocated to more secure areas of higher ground to maximize the production. This should become the practice of the park on the island as well. Once again, let's gather some research on what works other places before penalizing the human community. I do care about the wildlife of our island and recognize it is one of the aspects that makes our community unique but destroying the way of life for the people that love the island the most without scientific research and findings would be unjust.

Correspondence ID: 12990 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 14:30:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation. Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.

Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 12991 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: DUNNAGAN, MIKE G
Received: May,10,2010 14:30:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I DISAGREE WITH THE ENTIRE DEIS. IT IS TOTALLY NON SCIENTIFIC AND DEVOID OF ANY COMMON SENSE. -I HOPE YOU CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS TRUTHFULLY. 1. HAS ALL THIS CLOSURE BUSINESS BEEN PREDETERMINED? 2. HAS MIKE MURRAY BEEN OFFERED POST RETIREMENT EMPLOYMENT WITH AUDUBON, SELC, OR DEFENDERS OF WILDLIFE?

Correspondence ID: 12992 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Savage, Richard
Received: May,10,2010 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 Savage

Correspondence ID: 12993 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:31:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose the DEIS Alternate F proposal and support the Coalition for Beach Access in it's entirety. As a property owner on Hatteras Island I am very concerned about several aspects of this situation. I believe that the socioeconomic analysis is flawed. The "region of influence" which includes the northern beaches, including Duck and Southern Shores is not showing an accurate portrait of the impact these beach closures have had already, and will surely have in the future.
Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands are isolated from these areas. Typically visitors who recreate in the northern areas are not going to visit the southern areas. Beach closures in the National Seashore have no effect on them, thus the economy in these areas will stay relatively constant. I believe a fair analysis would consider ONLY the business entities on the islands.
The analysis also does not consider that for 2008 (when the consent decree was initiated), many of the reservations for that season had been booked in advance, many the previous year. It also does not include the full year for 2009. How can this possibly be accurate?
The analysis also utilized "model" projections for economic impact. Perhaps actual business survey data should be considered? Additionally the models project using stable, unchanging access corridors. It seems reasonable to expect increasing closures with increased bird and turtle numbers, thus decreased access.
I hope that you will consider the data that you are utilizing for your decisions. The potential to destroy business and impact lives in these areas is huge! The business community deserves a fair evaluation.
Thank you.
Nancy Johnson

Correspondence ID: 12994 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: wolf, robert
Received: May,10,2010 14:32:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Is there any reason why any ORV use should occur on our seashores?? This is very sensitive turf and why would you want to have it destroyed by hot-rodgers, or anyone for that matter. Do not let this happen. We have so little left.

Correspondence ID: 12995 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:32:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family has been privileged to vacation on the Outer Banks of North Carolina since the summer of 1962. Our greatest joy has been to be able to walk along the beaches, especially at "The Point" where we have witnessed the meeting of the two currents in sometimes dramatic and beautiful ways. We also enjoy gathering and sharing the various seashells that are washed in by the tide. I say this in order to let you know that we believe that all the National Seashore should be made available to persons, some with vehicles, to some of the greatest shore fishing, swimming and other recreational opportunities along the Eastern coastline. I disagree with some who would close the beaches to everyone in order for some of the wildlife to nest and procreate. The people who live on the Outer Banks and depend on visitors for their entire livelihood should not have to suffer extreme hardships when

no visitors come to this beautiful area of our country. It is extremely important that the residents be given first priority in all the decisions. No one should have to suffer in order that the wishes of a few be the final decision. I agree that there may be some areas (and only some) be set aside for nesting creatures for a limited time each season. As soon as the nesting season is complete, then the entire area should be open to people for their enjoyment. I hope that wiser heads may prevail in the final decision that is made and that all may be able to enjoy the natural beauty of the Outer Banks of North Carolina and all the National Seashore and Park Services that we have always enjoyed. Thank you for considering my comments.

Correspondence ID: 12996 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:33:09
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: 12997 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Douglas, Keith I
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

- 1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
- 2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
- 3) Page six and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.
- 4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors." However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)
- 5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.
- 6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.
- 7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.
- 8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.
- 9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest

survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%.

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules.

(p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "?prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

I recently purchased a Home in Avon with the intention of using it as an investment along with a 2nd vacation home. We intend on have pets allowed in our home in order to make our home more attractive from a rental standpoint. This restriction would provide a potential burden which would limit the amount of renters to our home. The real estate market is already in disrepair as it relates to Hatteras, this ban will only add to the financial strain of the homeowners. 15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you for considering these comments.

Correspondence ID:	12998	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Barrett, Nick				
Received:	May,10,2010 14:39:11				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>I am making this comment in strict opposition to the National Park Service's support of the Alternative F of the DEIS.</p> <p>I took my first baby steps on the sand of an Avon, NC beach, trying to walk towards my mother. Had this plan been in effect then, I may have not been able to ever do that. The DEIS?and in particular, Alternative F?has been taken way too far over the edge. To start, I've prepared some factual statements: In the beginning of the DEIS there is a list of federal rules and policies that the DEIS must comply with. MISSING from that list is compliance with the Regulatory Flexibility Act which requires "federal agencies to consider the effects of their regulatory actions on small businesses and other small entities and to minimize any undue disproportionate burden." When reading all the ways in which business WILL be affected, it is clear that this was not taken into consideration, and thus should stop the document from being passed.</p> <p>The authors of the document use numbers, estimations, and assumptions and mold them into propaganda. For example, on page 568 the "visitation" statistics are grossly inaccurate. There is no way to know how many people are riding in a vehicle (at least not the way the study was done) or whether the driver and/or passengers are indeed visitors at all. The study also doesn't take into account the high numbers of construction vehicles in the area as well as shipping or mail service vehicles. Attempts throughout the document are often made assuming that gross occupancy tax collected can be used as a method to determine the number of visitors. That being said, this has been proven as an inaccurate way to determine the number of visitors.</p> <p>On page 595 the document states, "This uncertainty may impact small businesses disproportionately." The Small Business Administration would include over 98% of Outer Banks Businesses as "Small Businesses". That being said, the authors of the DEIS should recognize that passing this plan would result in "disproportionately" effecting (i.e. in layman's terms, cripple, crush, or destroy) Outer Banks businesses.</p> <p>The ORV Management Plan is a minimal part of the document. For as long as I can remember, there has always been restricted ORV access on Outer Banks beaches. If the main goal of the plan in to limit ORV use and access, then why does so much of the document focus on pedestrian and recreational land use? Where is the evidence that pedestrians and recreational land users have negatively impacted the land any more than natural causes? There isn't any. It has been proven that the foot traffic on Jockey's Ridge State Park is negligible when considering that the wind alone moves enough sand to account for over 7,000 people walking on the sand 24 hours a day.</p> <p>There are also many mentions in the DEIS of forward-looking statements of what the NPS "will" do. Some of these are: pp 56. "This alternative would involve the construction of a pedestrian access trail and improvements and additions to the interdunal road system." pp 80. "?by improving interdunal road and ORV ramp access. Pedestrian access would be enhanced by providing increased parking capacity at various points of access to vehicle-free areas?" pp 81. "would include the construction of a short ORV route to access a new pedestrian trail to the south of Ocracoke Island?" pp. 593. "?additional pedestrian and ORV access would be facilitated by construction and relocation of access ramps, and the designation of ORV access corridors at Cape Point and South Point." Pp 598. "The extra efforts to increase ORV access and pedestrian access should increase the probability that the impacts are on the low rather than high end of the range." There is no appropriation in the NPS budget through 2011 for these plans so they should not be used to imply that they will minimize economic impact. These points should be disregarded and not used as part of a plan, unless they are part of the budget.</p> <p>Finally, it appears as if accurate scientific research has not been done about the true ecological impact of humans and their impact on select species in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and surrounding areas. How is it that, in 2009, after the Consent Decree had it's first full year in effect, that the numbers of piping plover's actually declined?and yet the National Park Service has selected Alternative F (which is even more extreme than the original Consent Decree) from the DEIS as their preferred option? Until there are concrete facts that actually prove that humans are destroying the habitat of the piping plover, sea turtles, and other creatures, why is this extreme plan being put into effect which will so negatively affect local business owners, tourists, and everybody else that visits the Outer Banks?</p>				
Correspondence ID:	12999	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Peters, Robert L				
Received:	May,10,2010 14:39:13				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Please protect the nesting seabirds by banning OHVs from the beach, dunes, and other nesting areas.				
Correspondence ID:	13000	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	private				
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>I have been visiting Cape Hatteras with my family and friends since the early 1970s. Much of the purpose of these trips has been surf fishing. In a nutshell, if access to the beach is restricted or eliminated to vehicles, I will have no reason to visit and spend money in this region any longer. The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.</p> <p>Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-I portions of SMAs. These corridors should provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.</p> <p>Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.</p> <p>The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.</p>				

Correspondence ID: 13001 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:40:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I'm just simply amazed at how far this thing has gone. Never has there been a problem with birds or turtles being killed to the point of extinction in this area. Yes, there have been a few instances of birds and turtles dying at the hands of humans, but for the norm, the coexistence of animals, vegetation and humans has never created a major problem. I'm not a local of the outer banks, but I've been vacationing there for over 40 years and I've found most of us visitors to be protective of wildlife in and around the area.
Then there are the people who do live there. They've been able to carve out a bit of a living from those of us who visit their towns and now the government is going to put a stop to that...for exactly what reason? If the government is so worried about the wildlife, why then are they paying a trapper to trap and kill so many other animals in the area? And, why is this never written about in the newspapers or opposed by such organization as PETA?
I just can't believe that anyone has the right to kill off another's abilities to make a living, especially when they are doing so in a way that is not affecting other animals, as they say is happening with the birds.
These birds are not even near extinction, and they nest in many areas of the eastern seaboard. So why single out the outer banks? People and animals and vegetation have been coexisting peacefully for hundreds of years.
Unbelievable what our government is doing. Think about it. Why?
I have briefly read some of the report and have to say there's nothing I agree with. It all seems to be based on individuals ideas, it doesn't make sense and it is not based on scientific research.
Keep the beaches open. Protect the birds, which by the way, nest in the dunes....not on the flat sandy expanses of beach. When a turtles' nest is found, fence it off. We have all coexisted in the past.....we can continue to do so now and in the future.

Correspondence ID: 13002 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:42:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to comment on this draft plan for ORV management on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I've been a regular user of the Park since I was a child brought to Avon by my parents in 1975. My mother, has been coming to the outer banks since she was a child, well before 1975. To say we are "lifers" would be an understatement. Our family owns a house in Avon, and while we are not there 100 percent of the time, we feel that it has become our second home. More importantly than our tenure, are the relationships we've been fortunate to foster with local residents, "islanders" if you will. It is these people that I am most concerned with as a result of the proposals being suggested in this plan. Local island life depends on tourist dollars. Tourist dollars that come to town as a result of access to the beach. Access to the shoreline. Access to the beauty the island offers and access to the waters around the island. Limiting this access will have a negative effect on this community's ability to provide for their families. My concern after reviewing this plan is one of genuine fear for the local economy and for future generations of those wishing to enjoy this pristine setting. As I dig deeper, my concern grows as I don't see many statements in this plan, outlining the protection and security of the local inhabitant's rights. In most cases, it appears that more effort is being placed on the security and rights of the wildlife in the area, rather than the local, taxpaying, constituents. I for one am in favor of rules and regulations that will allow for the balance of nature and people in the fair use of this wonderful setting. However, it seems after reading this draft that this is not about fair use, it's about limiting use for the people that would like to enjoy this park. The document appears to show bias toward the special interest groups that would like to see limited human enjoyment of an area that was, is and should stay a "recreation" area. Also, there are many references to this "plan" that utilize the wording "pedestrian access" yet this is being offered as an ORV plan. Why are limitations to pedestrian access being discussed in a plan that is meant to designate the ability of people to utilize off road vehicles? It seems that these 800+ pages of documentation are further reaching than the title suggests or implies. Specific items such as banning activity within 1,000 meters of a possible nest area do not appear to be realistic or practical. For an island that is in places, less than a 1,000 meters wide, this buffer seems to be arbitrary, as no amount of research that I've done on the NPS, FWS, Audobon society or any other scientific websites dictates that a buffer this large has increased breeding numbers. Historically, minimalist environmental management approaches have worked well throughout the US national parks. Closing extensive areas of beach, sound and water has not been proven as a means to help any species of animal. In an effort to prove the theory of "no access, abundant wildlife", I do hope that you will take into account the possible experiment may be severely damaging to a culture, community and possibly, other species of animals. At this time, it seems that there is a real opportunity for raising awareness, education, and enforcement of sensible rules and regulations that will ensure balance between humans and animals for many years to come. A process that could be regulated with intelligence and fairness funded by tax revenue and perhaps vehicle permits. Unfortunately, a majority of the action plans are so strict; they appear to only compound a bad situation. Less people, lower tax base, lower tax revenue, seems to ensure a lack of funding for programs that should be in place to enable the safe use of the seashore as well as education for programs designed to preserve endangered animals. This is without a doubt a critical time in the history of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I'm confident that when the original architects decided to build huge sand dunes to "protect the island", they didn't have the benefit of knowing how their act may endanger species of animals that required the natural flow of water over the sand to ensure their livelihood. Just as then, whatever decision that is reached will have many un-intended consequences for the wildlife, the local inhabitants, and the tourists hoping to enjoy this wonderful area. Please be thoughtful and consider both human life, as well as animal life when making your decision. I have already extended the Hanburger tradition of coming down to Hatteras Island numerous times during the calendar year. Since their birth, my children have enjoyed winters for the solitude, spring and fall for the changing temperatures and shifting sands and summer for the flow of people also looking to enjoy a glorious day at the beach complete with beautiful sunset. I noticed a quote on a forum dedicated to the enlightenment of those not aware of this current situation on Hatteras that struck me deeply. "If people, and especially children, cannot experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?" Please keep this question in mind as you pursue a decision on access in our National Seashore and Recreation area. For something as beautiful as the North Carolina Outer Banks to be truly enjoyed and appreciated, it has to be interactive. This interaction will stimulate a love for the area that will inspire preservation of its inhabitants, all of them, both human and animal. Again, I thank you for your time, and appreciate the ability to be able to comment on these proposed actions. Regards, Chris Hanburger Apex, NC ? Avon, NC Wake County ? Dare County

Correspondence ID: 13003 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: johnson, nancy a
Received: May,10,2010 14:46:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I oppose the DEIS alternative F on all counts and support the Coalition for Beach Access position statement.
I am a property owner on Hatteras Island. I rent a weekly vacation property that is "pet friendly". I am told by real estate company employees that the number of houses for rent that are pet friendly is up dramatically. The restriction that would be put on visitors with pets goes too far. As stated on P. 136, "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages" is tantamount to saying no pets in public areas, beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads from March 15-July 31.
In my opinion this is ludicrous! I support the beach coalition proposal that pets be allowed in these areas at all times as long as they are on a 6 foot leash. It is unfair to ask visitors to give up the right to have their pets with them. It is one of the advantages of staying in rental homes that entices pet owners to vacation on our island. There is no evidence that properly supervised and tethered animals are in any way responsible for disturbing nesting sights. You will effectively drive away a fair amount of visitors if this is passed. Please give this careful consideration.
Thank you.
Nancy Johnson

Correspondence ID: 13004 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Platt, David
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and creator of the Query Quest National Parks Educational Board Game, I appreciate 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 the NPCA's recommendations. The intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and limit or eliminate ORV use, which harms wilderness and wildlife resources. Please do not allow the impairment of enjoyment of those who visit national parks to experience the wonder of nature in peace. ORVs impair enjoyment for everyone not riding one.
Sincerely, David Platt
Query Quest Educational Board Games

Correspondence ID: 13005 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:49:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13006 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:49:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
Wildlife should be considered when devising your use plan for Hatteras beaches. We can't allow sea turtles, birds, and other wildlife numbers to deteriorate under any use plan for Hatteras. I recognize that those who would drive on beaches should be allowed to in certain circumstances, but wildlife (and their nesting) should not be harmed.
Please contact me if you would like to discuss this matter further.
Sincerely, Thomas A. Driscoll 504 Redbud Rd. Chapel Hill, NC 27514 spttdrdshnk@yahoo.com

Correspondence ID: 13007 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:49:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well

as breeding ones.

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

Correspondence ID: 13008 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:50:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13009 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:50:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The use of the beaches is a freedom everyone should have the opportunity to enjoy. We are retired seniors and have a home on Hatteras Island, to not be able to use the beaches would take away one of our reasons for coming to OBX.

Correspondence ID: 13010 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cox, Kyle B
Received: May,10,2010 14:53:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I understand that we have to protect our resources. But to go to the extremes of some of the proposed plans is plan childish. The "I want it all my way" of beach closures just shows how some people think that what they believe is right is better than every body elses. Some beach closures are understandable. But all the miles of beach that NC has and the few miles we are allowed to enjoy, some people selfishness wants to take that away because they believe they have to have it all. Myself and my family, call among our friends at least a few times a month to enjoy going to the beach. Just taking our jeeps or dune buggies, parking and hanging out in some of the most beautiful country this nation has. But if we cannot do that, or have to leave before sunset, and not be able to enjoy a fire under the stars with the waves cashing on shore, I'm afraid we will not be returning anymore. We do not go to atlantic beach for the sole reason that we cannot sit beside our vehicle. To see it all day knowing it is safe. And for the people that want all this control. To stop the economic business that ORVs bring to eastern NC, It will affect you with the rest of us. That money, as well as mine, will go to other places. That includes outside NC. That means that the money the people that get my money will not have that money to spend on other things. Which in turn will trickle down to you in one form or another. For the closures of species that are not endangered, is going overboard. If that is the case, nobody should even be allowed to walk into grass or in the woods. For the simple statement that you MIGHT step on some insect or animal that MAY be endangered one day. But hey. I have read that we should kill some animals to save another. How is it they decide which life is more important?

Correspondence ID: 13011 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:55:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Our beaches have always been open to vehicles and pedestrians to enjoy. Before highway 12 was even made people used the beach as a roadway. It is a shame that you are putting birds before people and their livelihoods. This island depends on the money from tourism and fisherman to survive. There was a piping plover in Carova but they didn't block that off or shut it down. There is the Darwin Theory where it is survival of the fittest, the birds will go where they are safe, just like all animals, they have instinct and nature just needs to be and humans just need to be, don't mess with it!!

Correspondence ID: 13012 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: : May 10, 2010 To: National Park Service From: Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments
My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and

Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%.

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fishermen want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USFS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 13013 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 14:56:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.

Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.

Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.

The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13014 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Delaney , Nathan J
Received: May,10,2010 14:57:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.

Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.

Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.

The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13015 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:58:47

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: keep it pristine i don't want to see vehicles everywhere the draw of the area is its isolation and beauty i would rather walk down to the beach than even drive down in 4wd the ocean roar is loud but i don't want to hear engines and smell gas while getting away from it all

Correspondence ID: 13016 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 14:59:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation. Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13017 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:00:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation. Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13018 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: johnson, nancy a
Received: May,10,2010 15:00:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a property owner on Hatteas Island. I oppose the DEIS Alternative F on all counts and support the position statement of the Coalition for Beach Access. The impact of the unrealistic buffers and beach closures affects Caper Hatteras in a myriad of ways. The one close to my heart is the loss of access to disabled people. The national seashore was created with a series of ramps to allow 4wd access to the beach while preserving the dune line. As a result there are very few parking spaces. Dare County reports there are 749 spaces; 25 of these are handicapped. Of those, 10 are at Coquina Beach which is not even on Hatteras Island. Of the 15 on Hatteras Island I challenge you to show me one that allows wheelchair access. My elderly parents fall into this category. They are also property owners in Avon. My father is an amputee and has trouble negotiating hard packed sand, let alone soft dune sand. The only way for them to fish and enjoy the beach they love is by 4wd. Without this the beach is 100% off limits to them. My family and I have visited and owned property on Hatteras Island for over 35 years. We have always been good stewards of the seashore. On more than one occasion WE have been the ones to call the park service to report unmarked nesting sites. We have NEVER knowingly disturbed any living creature on the beach. By adopting Alternative F you will effectively disenfranchise a large segment of the populaiaon. I am asking you to consider the human lives here, not just the animal lives. We have coexisted for many years so far and can continue to do so. Thank you.
Nancy Johnson

Correspondence ID: 13019 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Botelho, Kenneth A
Received: May,10,2010 15:00:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am an ORV owner/driver.I have been operating my ORV on the Cape Cod National Seashore since 1978.The Alternative F restrictions are more restrictive than any I have seen on any beach I have used. We have been subject to closures due the Piping Plover since 1988. We respect Tern nesting areas,but,Plovers get the whole beach until they can fly fifty feet.The presence of ORVs help to discourage predators. We drive day and night on C.C.N.S.We have speed limits,equipment requirements,and day limits during holiday weekends. C.C.N.S. allows pets. The owners are responsible to keep dogs on a leash and to pick up after them. ORV impact on resourcisis negligible.I believe that ORV tracks help hold the sand from blowing away in high winds.I believe the rules are needed to keep control of ORVs and pedestrians safe,but,should not ruin anyone's enjoyment on the seashore. Visitors to our seashores have an economic impact to the area.Hotels,service stations,restaurents,gift shops,tackle,and bait shops all benefit. In conclusion be fair,be mindful of all affected,and remember it's a recreational area not a jail.

Correspondence ID: 13020 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Burns , Greg
Received: May,10,2010 15:01:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.
 Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-I portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.
 Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.
 The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13021 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:04:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly object to closing beaches to dogs. Dogs on leashes should be permitted wherever pedestrians are permitted (with the exception of swimming areas as is the current policy). There is no evidence that prohibiting dogs on leashes would provide any additional protection where pedestrians are permitted.
 If the concern is that people would not abide by this law, then I believe you have the same concern if dogs are not permitted.

Correspondence ID: 13022 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Johnson, Nick
Received: May,10,2010 15:05:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.
 Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-I portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.
 Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.
 The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13023 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Withrow, Amanda
Received: May,10,2010 15:05:36
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: 13024 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:06:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off Road Vehicles do not belong on grounds of National Parks; they belong on private property where the owner absorbs cost to the environment, not the tax payer. Allocated Taxes are for the protection of our National Parks; these areas were set aside for the preservation of the park environment and

the spiritual beauty enjoyment citizens derive from visiting them. Not only irreversible, but expensive damage can occur with the use of noisy, messy to the environment, machines. Let the citizen who wants to enjoy nature aboard these vehicles purchase their own land to put their machine on...they are not interested in the value of a quiet respite to see, hear, smell and feel the wonders nature. Accessibility means that some of our citizens are limited to areas near parking lots and hopefully those in charge of designing park layout keep the needs of these 'access limited folks' in mind. Walkways into certain areas without loud concession stands, tour buses, etc., should not infringe on the quiet spiritual places that many citizens seek. Please, do not allow ORV into any of our National Parks, Forests, or Monuments. Our park's founding fathers intended these special spiritual places of beauty and uniqueness for generations to come and for all of our citizens to enjoy. Thank you for your consideration, Angela M. Garcia-Johnson

Correspondence ID: 13025 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:06:05

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Date: May 10, 2010
To: National Park Service
From: William C. Duncan

Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments

My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial

Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages
 ? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty, which manages my property for me.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs. 15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

William C. Duncan, owner

Land's End Cottage 41943 Ocean View Drive Avon, North Carolina

Correspondence ID: 13026 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Reed, Mary E
Received: May,10,2010 15:08:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I want to encourage you to ban Off-Road Vehicles from Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore except when they are providing transportation for physically handicapped individuals who have no other way to visit the park. In an area where the land is so delicate that it cannot survive use by off-road vehicles, it is foolish to allow national treasures to be destroyed. Thank you for considering my comments.

Correspondence ID: 13027 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Winslow, Kristine B
Received: May,10,2010 15:10:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Superintendent Murry,

I am writing today to make a formal comment on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The beach is a wonderful place a place to spend time with family, relax & enjoy the outdoors. If the access is closed how are people going to enjoy this. Isn't that what a National Park is for? Isn't that what a National park was suppose to be, a place for families to enjoy nature at its finest. Not be blocked by ropes and signs saying its there but you cant go through. It is sad to say but if the beach accesses are closed you might as well tell the families that have lived there their entire lives to pack up and leave. There will be no revenue for the people to make to survive. The whole hatteras island/Ocracoke area will be a ghost town. Is that what we want as a state on our shoulders? A state that closes two islands down because of birds. Makes families loose their homes, jobs everything due to birds that arent even endangered? I have read where other areas have moved nest to higher elevations on the beach to protect them & had a higher success rate. Why cant we do this? We move them in threats of storms so why cant we move them any other time. Or why even bother at all THEY ARENT ON THE EXSTINTION LIST!. The ponds off the point could be cleared and used for them. The outer banks generates alot of money for our state, how are we going to recoup that income. The taxes that are collected down there help with things all over this state. If people stop coming to the island there goes the money there goes the state. I am asking please reconsider the alternatives before closing off access to the beach. It is many families past-times for generations. It is a way some make a living. A National Park is for people to see & enjoy not be blocked off from enjoying. Thank you!

Correspondence ID: 13028 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: wheless, karen s
Received: May,10,2010 15:11:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Subject: DEIS - See/use Dr. Michael A. Berry's speech shown at end / Posted by: karen w. / 05/10/10

I stand in support of bill H.R. 718 To Reinstate the Interim Management Strategy governing off-road vehicle use in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, North Carolina, pending the issuance of a final rule for off-road vehicle use by the National Park Service. H.R. 718 and the Preserving Public Access to Cape Hatteras Beaches Act of 2009 (S.1557) are important to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area public beach access and America's enjoyment of their park.

Beach enjoyment and surf fishing at Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area is like a religion for folks like my husband who loves fishing there more than life itself. But it's not just the fishing, it is the being there (for all Americans and their families) that is a sort of religion. At the public meeting in Raleigh NC a few weeks ago I made public comments about this, and I talked about about my father and his fishing buddies frequently landing a single engine plane right at the beach in the 50's and 60's and camping on the beach. This tradition is no longer, and I know and accept that things change through the years, they must, and the times of beach plane landing/tent camping is over now, some 50 years later.

However, the basic real truth of this issue is, that with common sense and continued greater attention and management by the National Parks Service, the protection of resources, the birds and turtles, the ORV access should remain as it has in the past before Judge Boyle's broad ranging biased consent decree went into effect. It MUST revert back to the way it was for cultural reasons, and for survival the "human species", the local people who "inhabit" that beautiful and remote area, many whose families have persevered there for generations. through the years these good people have saved lives (that is what the area is most known for). They have saved human lives, saved turtle's lives, and protected and looked after birds and other species, and kept this whole remote area alive. Those people are becoming an "endangered species" now because of the consent decree and beach closings. Let's use some common sense here because they are suffering and the local economy is devastated.

From all that I have read, there have been only a hand full of nesting pairs of piping plovers yearly at Cape Hatteras National Seashore any way, regardless of the NPS action or the volatile weather conditions or natural predators or not. It would be different altogether if this was like the Great Lakes area where the plover habitat is ideal. A little common sense should prevail here. That is the bottom line. We are talking about a very, very few birds in the big scheme of things.

Personally, I want to say to the National Parks Service and other decision makers, community and political figures fighting for right; do not allow these special interest groups and court actions intimidate you - and do not allow the manipulation of the facts and the "shell game", that the Defenders of Wildlife and Audubon Society are playing, deter you from making commonsense decisions. I must believe that fairness will out in the end. Don't be afraid to say what is right and God will help this fair and right thing to happen and speak through you and others. So, NPS do your job and the right thing, without intimidation. Do the right thing.

As a long time North Carolina resident, and current property owner in Avon, NC, I have enjoyed, and hope to continue to enjoy, this treasured National Seashore Recreation Area at Cape Hatteras NC, along with other Americans and the general public, for years to come. That is why I am making this public comment.

In addition, I would like to say that I also fully support the thoughts and facts contained in the following letter submitted to and read to the National Parks Service by Dr. Michael A. Berry:

-----START QUOTE----- Dr Michael A. Berry -----
 April 27, 2010
 Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
 Comments on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore ORV Management Plan DEIS I wish to thank the National Park Service for an opportunity to comment on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore ORV Management Plan DEIS. As a concerned citizen, scientist, retired public administrator and university educator, I feel it is my professional and civic duty to make timely comment on a matter that affects thousands of citizens who wish to visit and have access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

For the record, I have a broad public service, technical, and scientific background. I have in-depth knowledge of environmental sciences, research methods, and review procedures, especially those related to human health. I have basic knowledge of the federal environmental statutes and programs, and many years of firsthand experience with federal environmental policy-making processes. I hold the following degrees: Doctor of Philosophy in Public Health with a specialty in environmental management and protection from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Master of Science in Management from Duke University's Fuqua School of Business; both Bachelor and Master of Science degrees in Mathematics from Gonzaga University. I am a retired Lieutenant Colonel, Army Engineers and a combat veteran of the Viet Nam War. I have from time to time advised the Chief of Army Engineers and Under Secretary of Defense for Environment on a range of environmental issues, projects, and policies. In my civilian life, I retired from the US Environmental Protection Agency in 1998 after a 27-year career with that agency. For over 22 years, I served as the Deputy Director of the National Center for Environmental Assessment at Research Triangle Park, NC. During my EPA career I had extensive interactions with foreign, state, and local governments; federal environmental agencies and offices; the federal courts; US Congress; universities world-wide; institutions to include the National Academy of Sciences, the World Health Organization, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; the major environmental organizations; private industry and trade associations. For more than 20 years, I was either an adjunct or full-time faculty member at the University of North Carolina where I taught environmental science and management courses in the Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, the Kenan-Flagler Business School, and Environmental Studies Program.

I wish to state clearly for the public record that I have been for the past four decades and remain today and forever in the future, professionally committed to protection of the environment. I am primarily concerned with environmental conditions that affect the health and well-being of humans and with the conservation of natural resources that are essential components of a healthy environment. Given the ever changing environmental conditions brought about by growing human populations and expanding regional and global economies, effective environmental management is more essential now than ever before, but never at the expense of violating human and Constitutional rights of citizens.

I reside at - - - - - , North Carolina. I can be contacted with regard to these comments at drmikeberry@gmail.com.

Comment 1 There is a clear need for an equitable, balanced, and effective seashore access policy and management plan. Growing national population, seashore visitation, transportation avenues into the Outer Banks region mandates an access management policy?but one which has widespread public support and one that balances the rights and traditions of public use and access to the national seashore with responsible but reasonable resource protection.

As currently structured, Alternative F is not primarily an ORV management plan. It is primarily a public access restriction plan. The plan is biased toward bird and turtle protection, seashore isolation and not to a reasonable extent on public use and visitor access? specifically ORV and pedestrian access.

Responsible environmental management uses sound science and unbiased professional judgment that balances the human needs and rights of people with the needs to manage and sustain natural processes. The preferred proposal, Alternative F, fails to meet these criteria. Alternative F fails to recognize objective science, enabling legislation, citizen rights, historical uses, and past promises of access to their environment.

Promulgation of Alternative F as it is currently structured will be the basis for widespread public dissatisfaction, continued distrust of government, especially the National Park Service, and costly litigation.

Comment 2 As indicated by Alternative F, it is the intention of National Park Service (NPS) to transform a major part of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area? set aside over 70 years ago for use and enjoyment of American citizens?? into a wildlife sanctuary, predominantly a national bird and turtle use area. NPS is using as its justification for this radical transformation and departure from traditional and intended public use, a thirty-five year old executive order directing NPS to formally promulgate an ORV management plan.

Alternative F management plan, with its excessive restrictions and denial of public access, both pedestrian and ORV, is in large part incompatible with the legislative purpose and intent of why the national seashore was established (16USC459 CHNSRA Enabling Legislation):

"said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area."

Nowhere is it indicated in the DEIS where enabling legislation intends or permits both pedestrian and vehicular access denial for a major part of the year, particularly visitor or vacation season.

Comment 3 NPS Request for public comment appears to be more of a bureaucratic process than a search for substantive decision-making information. By virtue of its massive size, complexity, biased and incomplete explanation of science, and the inability for members of the public to access cited scientific literature and references, and ask questions of government officials responsible for the science and DEIS content, no single citizen can effectively review, understand, and constructively comment or suggest improvement to the DEIS in the 60 day comment period.

It appears by way of emphasis in the discussion in the DEIS that NPS has every intention to promulgate Alternative F in the next year, regardless of past or present public comment. There is virtually no significant reference to the workbooks the public provided in the early stages of the plan development process or to countless constructive comments made by the public during the 15 month Regulation Negotiation Process.

The National Park Service (NPS) should make it known to the public the specific information it seeks so as to make a final, objective decision with regard to an ORV management plan for Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore Recreational Area. Thus far NPS has failed to do so. By not asking for specific information, NPS is simply "going through the motions" superficially, and wasting the public's time.

Comment 4 NPS presents Alternative F as if it were recommended by the recent Regulatory Negotiation process. However, upon close examination Alternative F is found to be a biased and highly restrictive management plan that is in complete opposition to majority recommendations of the recent Regulation Negotiation process. Alternative F strengthens and codifies the denial of public access provisions of the current consent decree. The public access denying provisions of the consent decree, put into effect April 30, 2008, have been extended and transferred to Alternative F. The majority of Regulatory Negotiation Committee stakeholders (19 vs. 5) and numerous public commentators did not recommend an extension of the restrictive provisions of the consent decree as part of a final ORV plan.

Comment 5 If promulgated, Alternative F will significantly change the economy and unique culture of the Outer Banks. The DEIS has failed to properly assess those changes. The Economic Impact Analysis found the DEIS by its own admission is incomplete. This alone is the basis for future litigation challenging the legality of the proposed plan. In addition the Economic analysis is structured in such a manner that it fails to address full costs? direct costs, indirect costs, lost opportunity costs, costs of future liability, and hidden costs.

The Economic Analysis fails to recognize that the national seashore environment is a unique form of capital that serves the local economy, and in turn the health and wellbeing of citizens and families that depend of that economy. Access to the seashore is essential for family business operations on the Outer Banks.

The cost to society and the local communities under the restrictive consent decree has now been extended indefinitely into Alternative F. Economic losses in millions of dollars have occurred to island businesses especially motels, campgrounds, restaurants and tackle shops. The full costs of Alternative F are very much understated in the DEIS. Annual economic losses under the consent decree are already in excess of those estimated by Research Triangle Institute.

Comment 6 The DEIS has failed to inform the public of the extent of expected closures to the most popular recreational sites of the national seashore. Experience with the consent decree closures for the past two years (2008, 2009) provide a clear indication of the extent to which the national seashore will be closed to public access? ORV and pedestrian. In recent court testimony the National Seashore Superintendent indicated the extent of the closures, but nowhere does that data appear in the DEIS. The public should know what to expect when Alternative F is promulgated.

The Bodie Island Spit was closed a total of 136 days in 2009. Cape Point was closed 101 days in 2009. The Hatteras Island Spit was closed 125 days and south Ocracoke was closed 80 days. These are some of the most popular recreational use areas at the national seashore which will not be accessible to the public during late spring and summer months.

Comment 7 Nowhere in the DEIS is it indicated that should listed species populations grow in size through natural population cycles or management programs, the public loses even more access given the way the boundary distance are applied.

Comment 8 Nowhere in the DEIS is it mentioned that protected species populations are growing without the needs of additional restrictions such as those of consent decree and Alternative F.

Published USFWS data suggests that the piping plover is "recovering" well beyond 1986 levels and do not suggest that additional restrictions beyond regional recovery plans are necessary or essential at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area for the continued recovery of the species. Piping Plover--Atlantic Coast Pairs

Year 1986 1999 2005 2006 2007 Nesting Pairs (est.) 790 1386 1632 1749 1880

<http://www.fws.gov/northeast/pipingplover/index.html>

Comment 9 Data collected and published by NPS in recent suggest that Cape Hatteras National Seashore Interim Management Plan prepared with public input and publically reviewed in 2005, published in the Federal Register was showing every sign of being effective at protecting birds and natural resources. The Interim Management Plan was set aside by the court and replaced by the consent decree and settlement that mandated extensive closures without public comment or review.

The consent decree closures of recent years have been of exorbitantly high cost to the public but have not contributed to an improvement in species production or safety. The consent decree has produced no natural resource benefit over and above the interim plan. The fledge counts were higher under the interim plan than under the consent decree. 7 Piping Plovers fledged in 2008 under the interim plan, 6 in 2009 under the highly restrictive consent decree. 17 American Oyster Catchers (AMOY) fledged in 2008 under the interim plan and 13 in 2009 under the highly access restrictive consent decree, the same management structure now found in Alternative F. Species productivity is decreasing under consent decree and now Alternative F restrictions.

Comment 10 The majority of nests and hatched birds the past two closure seasons under the consent decree were lost to predation, a few to storms, one at the hands of a university researcher trying to band a bird. None has been lost to ORVs or pedestrians accessing the national seashore. The huge closure distances in the consent decree and Alternative F restrictions keep pedestrians and ORVs off the seashore while birds are nesting. At the same time, the extensive closures also provide for the proliferation and increased free movement of predators. In effect, the extensive closures create an ecological trap for birds in large closures that encourage and enhance predation.

Comment 11 When the boundary distances shown on Table 11 are applied to the Alternative F framework, it is evident that the public, ORV and pedestrian, lose access to a vast amount of the seashore for most of the visitor season. Closure boundaries are overly restrictive at CHNSRA and are not used at other NPS properties. There has been no administrative or science based explanation given to the public for these especially restrictive closures that limit public access to the seashore.

NPS has failed to explain specifically why, by way of science justification, 1000 meter boundaries must be established every time a Plover chick is observed, where the literature indicates on average movement under 200 meters. There is no study or science based explanation that justifies an automatic 1000 meter boundary closure every time a plover chick is observed. In fact the public access denial consequences of such management policy for a national seashore set aside for public use is excessive and does not indicate a balance of responsible usage.

If, as the Alternative F regulation dictates, one extends a boundary out 1000m in every direction from a nest, one creates a circle with a boundary circumference of approximately 3.9 miles, and an area of approximately 1.2 square miles or approximately 775 acres. Given that the boundary regulation dictates 775 acres of national seashore be set aside for the exclusive use of a plover chick?during the height of vacation and visitor season, it obviously does not take too many widely distributed plover chicks to shut down a significant portion of Cape Hatters National Seashore Recreational Area especially if the Plover population increases.

Comment 12 Alternative F, as with the consent decree, establishes a policy of denial of access punishment for the general public when intrusions into closure areas occur. Every time there is a closure intrusion the National Park Service, now at its own discretion, extends restrictive boundaries and widens non-access areas. There is no basis in science or environmental management practices that justifies such punitive measures.

Comment 13 Many of the references used to justify Alternative F are those of individuals and activists organizations who have supported litigation that denies public access. The major science references are published by environmental activist organizations and authored by individuals trying to shut down ORV access to the national seashore: Audubon, Blue Water, Hatteras Island Bird Club, etc. Most of these references have not been reviewed for their accuracy or objectivity and are unsuitable for government decision-making. Many of the references are out dated, biased, contain incomplete and misleading information, and few have ever been reviewed in open forum.

Comment 14 NPS has failed to provide the public with essential items of information, specifically properly reviewed science. The main science references are unsuitable and inappropriate as the basis for a government regulation that restricts public access to the national seashore and has significant negative impacts on the Outer Banks economy.

The 2005 USGS Protocols are indicated by NPS as the primary basis for the highly restrictive boundary distances that restrict public access to the national seashore. The USGS Protocols are cited as being "in press" 5 years after they first appeared on the Park Service website. The 2005 USGS Protocols were challenged two years ago as being in non compliance with USGS Peer Review Policy. At that time the documents were not dated, had no government publication number, and were not published in the open literature or Federal Register and were clearly unsuitable to be a credible scientific basis for government decision-making, especially costly regulation. The documents were sent back to USGS for "review" in 2009, five years after they were first made known to the public.

NPS has indicated a new citation for the USGS Protocols. They are currently referenced on page 660 as: Cohen, J.B., R.M. Erwin, J.B. French Jr., J.L. Marion, and J.M. Meyers In press, Recommendations for Management of Endangered Species at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2009-1262.

NPS uses the USGS protocol recommendations as if they are "best available science." They are not science and have not been shown to be connected with specific scientific studies. The management options presented in the protocols are the policy and management recommendations and opinions of biased and non-reviewed contributors, deemed by USGS to the "experts." Nowhere is a specific science basis (study, data) for a given management option?established solely for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area??demonstrated.

In a slightly modified introduction to the most recent release of the Protocols, the government official responsible for the document states: "Although no new original research or experimental work was conducted, this synthesis of the existing information was peer reviewed by over 15 experts with familiarity with these species. This report does not establish NPS management protocols but does highlight scientific information on the biology of these species to be considered by NPS managers who make resource management decisions at CAHA."

The new publication was not accessible, peer reviewed, or fully explained by government authority at the time the DEIS was submitted to the public for comment in early March 2010.

The literature reviews found in the USGS Protocols as currently published are significantly out of date. In fact many studies were decades out of date at the time the document was prepared in 2005. They are mainly non-replicated, selective papers and studies. Many citations are over 20 years old and most are not related to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. The public does not have access to the literature reviewed in this essential report and most of the citations are so insignificant they cannot even be found in a major university library (UNC-CH).

Comment 15 There is an "appearance of impropriety" and "conflict of interest" associated with the primary science basis justification for the Alternative F recommendation.

As noted two years ago, the cited protocols are not reviewed consistent with published USGS peer review policy guidelines (<http://www.usgs.gov/usgs-manual/500/502-3.html>) especially with regard to full disclosures and conflicts of interests. In fact the Protocols were developed and prepared in large part by well known environmental activists who subsequently used them as the basis for law suit against NPS, thus creating a very clear conflict of interest in full view of the federal government.

A review of the public record indicates that USGS commissioned well known environmental activist scientists to selectively review and discuss the science as they choose to represent it, and then formulate and recommend management options and policies. There was no outside questioning and review of their work--paid for by federal tax dollars.

It is clear to those of us who understand the scientific methods and process, objective scientific review, and the internal workings of federal government, that the 2004-2005 cooperative agreement review of the science (undertaken in part by members of the Audubon Society and other activist organizations) is biased and selective, misrepresented, fraught with speculation and opinion, and in many cases based on information that has nothing whatsoever to do with Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

In 2005 the architects of the access denying protocols were acknowledged for their contributions. For nearly three years now we have asked NPS and USGS to identify the "independent outside reviewers" of the USGS Protocols consistent with USGS Peer Review Policy. We are now being informed by USGS through their press office that the "science peer reviewers" are the original contributors and architects of the Protocols (which are not science at all, but policy and management opinions/recommendations that regulate the public and deny public access to the national seashore). We are also being informed by press officials that it is the policy of USGS to not identify outside independent peer reviewers or their comments. This is a violation of the Freedom of Information Act and the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Some of the original contributors (Cohen and Golder) have used the Protocols to be the basis for litigation and insist on denial of public access to the seashore. A lead author "J.B. Cohen" has previously shown his conflict of interest and activist affiliation when he "J.B. Cohen" signed a sworn affidavit in support of the Consent Decree for SELC (2008) and also signed the recent Audubon letter directed at NPS Officials recommending the highest level of access restriction (2009). Scientists working on behalf of the public cannot turn around and use that same work to sue to public without having the objectivity of their work called into question.

For over 15 months of Regulation Negotiation Process, Golder, other environmental activist members, and the federal government never disclosed participants' roles in the design of the Protocols, but constantly referred to them as being the definitive "best available science" justification for closures. Golder and others now appear as "peer reviewers" of their own work. This is discrediting in and of itself, but what is most disturbing and unethical about this is the fact that this highly biased, pseudo science process, sponsored by the federal government, has denied thousands of citizens access to their national seashore and will continue to do so unless it corrected by NPS, the federal courts, or the congress.

The above is clearly a "apparent conflict of interest" known to NPS and USGS officials and calls into question the credibility of science which in the public policy making process??specifically that of denying public access to the national seashore??must be "objective" beyond any doubt. Local media have noted this "apparent conflict of interest" and brought it to the attention of NPS and USGS officials who refuse to offer an explanation or response. The best course of action to resolve this matter is to turn the science review and update over the National Academy of Sciences or some other neutral party, to objectively, critically, and comprehensively review all relevant science, disclose the facts and restore some public trust in the scientific process used as the basis for environmental management decisions at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Respectfully Submitted

Michael A. Berry

-----END QUOTE-----

In closing, again, I stand in support of bill H.R. 718 To Reinstate the Interim Management Strategy governing off-road vehicle use in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, North Carolina, pending the issuance of a final rule for off-road vehicle use by the National Park Service. H.R. 718 and the Preserving Public Access to Cape Hatteras Beaches Act of 2009 (S.1557) are important to Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area public beach access.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Wheless ksw4obx@gmail.com

Correspondence ID: 13029 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Church, Cassandra
Received: May,10,2010 15:12:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Habitat for animals is the most important priority for the park, and pedestrian traffic is important too. Keep the park quiet, and healthy, get rid of off road vehicles

Correspondence ID: 13030 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hogg, Rick
Received: May,10,2010 15:13:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: First and foremost, it is disingenuous of the NPS to call the DEIS an "Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan." In fact, the document itself encompasses nearly every activity, recreational or otherwise, that concerns access to the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area (CHNSRA). It seems as though the official name of the Park has been unilaterally stripped of "Recreation Area" by the NPS and Department of the Interior. In fact, the citizens of Hatteras Island at the time of the Seashore's founding voiced concerns over future access to the beach. At the time, then NPS director Conrad Wirth assured the public, "There will always be access to the beach for all people, whether they are local residents or visitors." I am not in favor of the NPS preferred Alternative F as it violates the purpose of the founding of the Seashore as a recreation area. I understand there is a need for resource protection and to balance environmental sensitivity with the needs of different user groups. That said, the preferred alternative grossly favors the resource protection side of the argument and unfairly restricts access. Please see below for specific concerns I have with the scope of the DEIS.

Additional Ramps Which ever plan the NPS chooses to implement, I would recommend that the addition of new ramps be made a priority. I would recommend several new ramps between Ramps 23-34 and Ramps 45-49. Adding ramps would help keep more of the beach open especially as many ramps have been closed due to nesting activity in close proximity to the ramp. There may be miles of open beach beyond the ramp that would be accessible if more ramps were installed. Another point involving the ramps- the existing ramps should also be upgraded and/or improved for the sake of visitor safety. Each ramp should be two lanes and have should also have a separate corridor for pedestrian access. At some of the ramp pedestrians walking on the ORV are difficult to spot. Ramp 38 comes to mind, it is steep and you must carry forward momentum in order to avoid getting stuck. It is difficult to spot pedestrians or other trucks until you crest the top of the ramp. Improving safety at the access points should be an essential mandate for the NPS going forward.

Resources Closures The buffers provided for nesting shore-birds are excessive under the NPS preferred alternative. The 1000 meter buffer for Piping Plover (PIPL) unfledged chicks is especially draconian. Appendix G of the USFWS Atlantic Coast PIPL Recovery Plan mentions the need for a 1000 meter buffer in cases where broods are not monitored. However, in CHNSRA, PIPL activity is monitored daily thus would qualify according to Appendix G, for a 200 meter vehicle free zone around the brood. The 200 meter buffer would allow flexibility to the NPS to move or expand the buffer as needed while still allowing for the maximum amount of beach to remain open for public use. The minimum buffers for American Oystercatchers and colonial waterbirds are also too restrictive under the NPS preferred alternative. The scientific basis for the AMOY and CWB closures should be revisited. For example, the recommended buffer for an AMOY brood under the NPS preferred alternative is 300 m for nesting and rearing. That said, Table 28 on page 233 in the DEIS, "BUFFER DISTANCES RECOMMENDED FOR AMERICAN OYSTERCATCHERS," none of six studies referenced mentioned 300 m. The flush distances in the studies cited range from 30-200 meters. This leaves the reader wondering whether the scientific basis for said buffer is actually documented. Overall, AMOY and CWB should not be afforded the same protection as PIPLs since they are not listed as endangered or threatened. The goals of balancing access and resource protection would be better served under Alternative A of the DEIS.

Resource Accounting Regardless of the plan that is implemented, the NPS should include other surrounding areas in its bird count statistics. They should specifically include Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge and the dredge islands near the seashore. The dredge islands afford an excellent predator free environment for shorebird nesting activity. These habitats naturally siphon off some of the birds that would otherwise nest in the confines of CHNSRA. The fact that birds at such locations, which are in view from the Seashore are not including in the counts is absurd. If the overall goal is to increase nesting activity in the Seashore, should not these birds be included in statistics to provide a more accurate picture of their activity? Why wouldn't the NPS consider creating additional suitable habits such as the dredge islands? These questions are not adequately answered in the DEIS.

Impacts to Vacationers to CHNSRA Traditionally, the most desirable areas for recreation in CHNSRA can only be accessed by ORV. Throughout the Seashore, there are inadequate parking facilities close enough to for beachgoers to actually access the beach. For example, Cape Point and Hatteras and Ocracoke Inlets are vast distances away from any parking facilities. Without ORVs, these prime recreation areas would be virtually inaccessible for all but the strongest visitors to the Seashore. Similarly, one of the great attractions about vacationing on Hatteras Island is that you do not need to rent an oceanfront home to access the beach. The fact is that ORVs allow vacationers of diverse economic backgrounds to visit and enjoy CHNSRA. Most families cannot afford to pay a minimum of several thousand dollars a week to rent an oceanfront or ocean-side cottage in prime season. Instead, ORV access to the beaches allow for visitors to find a suitable rental or campground on the island regardless of the proximity to beach access. This is especially true for so-called "soundside" rentals. To access the beach on foot from these houses requires a trip across NC Route 12 and is often a significant walk distance-wise. There are very few defined crosswalks throughout the island, making crossing the highway a difficult/dangerous proposition at times, especially during the peak season. Walking long distances such as from a sound-side cottage is made even more difficult when you are laden with all the necessities for enjoying your day the beach. This proposition becomes even more difficult when young children, the elderly, handicapped or pets are involved. In most walk-over locations in the villages and there are no boardwalks or stairs to cross the dunes. Without ORVs, the aforementioned have difficulty accessing the beach even from oceanfront cottages. As there are absolutely zero public parking facilities located in the Villages on Hatteras Island, the closures that would occur under Alternative F would unfairly limit the beach access of middle income families and other groups during the nesting season.

Economic Impact The economic impact study conducted for the proposed alternatives underestimates the impact to the local businesses on Hatteras Island. The entire region, including the northern Beaches (Nags Head, Kitty Hawk, Duck, etc.), should not have been included in this study. These beaches are not part of the Seashore, nor are they dependent on ORV access of the beaches for tourism. The foundation of the Hatteras Island economy is built on access to the surf zone. Widespread closures of the beach under the NPS preferred alternative would have predictable, extremely severe impacts to the majority of Island businesses. I would propose that study of all the individual businesses on the Island be conducted in order to collect data pre-Consent Decree and post-Consent Decree. This would likely paint a much dire picture of the future of the Island economy if Alternative F (similar closures to Consent Decree) indeed becomes the final plan.

Conclusion The NPS and Department of the Interior should not capitulate to the collective will of the special interests groups. Instead, the NPS should create a plan that balances resource protection and beach access. Of the six Alternatives, I stand in support of Alternative A. The NPS is preferred alternative is flawed on many levels and would be devastating to the Island economy and equally devastating to the public enjoyment of CHNSRA.

Thank you
Rick Hogg Baltimore, MD May 10, 2010

Correspondence ID: 13031 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:17:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a nature lover and U.S. citizen who spent family vacations on Cape Hatteras in the 1960's and early '70's, I am saddened and dismayed at the prospect of more and more ORVs being allowed to fill that beautiful place with noise, commotion, and gasoline stink, annoying humans and terrorizing wildlife. If at all, ORV's should be sharply restricted in national parks and other such areas. Those who like that kind of thing, should go watch NASCAR, or get involved in hot rodding or go cart racing on an appropriate track, not in the middle of a park where people come to get away from the

internal combustion engine and all the stress and problems it causes. Thank you.

Correspondence ID:	13032	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 15:19:15						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I disagree with the buffer zones. As a visitor to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area for more than 25 Years and a home owner there for 14 years, I have made an effort to study the history and ecology of the area. My experience with members of the plover family (specifically killdeer) is that they are very tolerant of human activity. There is no scientific justification for this draconian 1000 meter buffer. A buffer of 100 meters would be more than sufficient to protect the nesting piping plovers.						
Correspondence ID:	13033	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,10,2010 15:19:54						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I believe that the seashore should not be opened to any form of vehicle recreation. Vehicles are enormously destructive to fragile habitat like that which occurs on beaches and in sand dunes. The piping plover in particular would be extremely vulnerable to ORV recreation. According to the IUCN: "This species has a small population which has declined significantly since the 1950s. However, there have been overall population increases since 1991 as a result of intensive conservation management, so the species is listed as Near Threatened. It is still dependent on intensive conservation efforts, so if these cease, or if trends reverse, then it would warrant immediate uplisting again." Opening the beaches to this kind of destruction is exactly the kind of thing that will warrant the uplisting of this bird. Additionally, female loggerhead, green, and leatherback sea turtles nest on your beaches. Green turtles have been undergoing serious population decline in the last few years, and it is critical to the preservation of the species to preserve as much nesting habitat as possible. Leatherback turtles are listed as critically endangered by the IUCN. It would show enormous disregard for the mission of the NPS to protect our natural environment, to allow the use of offroad vehicles at Cape Hatteras. Vehicles will also decrease the air quality at the the National Seashore, and make the park less enjoyable for the other visitors who enjoy the natural sounds of the wilderness.						
Correspondence ID:	13034	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative 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 completely opposed to the preferred alternative because ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. I am concerned about the impacts on wildlife; moreover this alternative is improperly skewed to ORV users and does not represent a fair balance for others. Most important is that the plan would not protect the natural resources and wildlife. The preferred plan is unacceptable because it fails to set aside sufficient areas where ORVs are prohibited year round in order to protect wildlife during breeding, migrations, and overwintering. I am also concerned that the plan fails to include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. In cases in which the annual reviews show that recovery is not proceeding as desired, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. . Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.						
Correspondence ID:	13035	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 15:19:58						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park. * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.						
Correspondence ID:	13036	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 15:20:04						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to						

provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13037 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:20:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13038 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:20:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13039 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:20:08
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 family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: 13040 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Jurjans, Janis
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Keep our beaches open

Correspondence ID: 13041 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been coming to the Outer Banks for family recreation for over 40 years. In 2007 my wife and I bought a home there in Kill Devil Hills with the hope of continuing to enjoy in our retirement, the recreational opportunities available in the Hatteras National Seashore Recreational area. For us this means visiting the beaches and for me it means surf fishing primarily on the beaches south of Oregon Inlet. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support reasonable restrictions to protect the birds, turtles, and other wildlife. However, I believe the favored alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to achieve the goal of protecting the Seashore. I have agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone any decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points by the Coalition for Beach Access. I have dreamed for most of my adult life of spend much of my retirement years enjoying the recreational opportunities available on the Outer Banks. Please do not destroy my dream. Stephen S. Carpenter

Correspondence ID: 13042 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:22:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation. Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13043 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:25:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area DEIS Comments with Additional Observations
 Submitted by Robert E. Lick on May 10, 2010
 Comments:
 The National Park Service (NPS) Preferred Alternative F offered in the DEIS if implemented would have very serious negative impacts on all recreational opportunities, residents and business owners on the Outer Banks with very little overall benefit to the wildlife of the Seashore. I fine the DEIS Position Statement offered by the Coalition to Preserve Beach Access to be far more acceptable because it contains common sense alternatives. The Coalition folks put forth their alternative in far less than the 8.3 pounds and 800 plus pages that the NPS did. I suppose the NPS could use a course in the KISS System. Of particular interest is the Coalitions common sense position on Corridors and Management Buffers. The NPS Alternative F position is extreme in each area and needs to be modified in line with the Coalitions suggestions. All, not some, closed areas require corridors to allow public access to the entire shoreline. Buffers (closed areas) should not be arbitrary, but based on peer-reviewed science. The National Park Service Plan is not only severely impacting recreation opportunities at Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area it is ultimately changing the way people have lived on the Outer Banks for generations. This alone is a very sad commentary on our government in my view. As I read the many affidavits put forth by business people of the Outer Banks explaining how beach closures have greatly impacted their businesses it is heart breaking to me that our government can cause such turmoil in people lives. Rather than the NPS Preferred Alternative F, I urge the NPS to accept the Coalition to Preserve Beach Access proposals in the Final Plan.
 Additional Observations:

0012370

My observations come from over 60 years as an avid striped bass surf caster on the east coast from Maine to North Carolina. Over this long period I have commented on NPS management plans for all National Seashore Recreation Areas on the east coast. During this time I have also subsequently watched surf casting opportunities and access lost at all of our Seashores in varying degrees. When originally established all National Seashores were to be managed with recreation as the primary mission. What has happened to the will of Congress?

The sixty day comment period mandated by NPS for the Cape Hatteras DEIS is unreasonable and I will not type the words I feel for the thirty day extension request denial. In my case the sixty day comment period was filled with a trip to Florida for a grandsons wedding, a trip to Pittsburgh for another grandsons college graduation, work and maintaining a household. I took today off to offer my comments with subsequent loss of pay. My point in saying this is to offer the thought that folks have a life besides being glued to an 800 page NPS document and NPS arrogance would not even allow a thirty day extension.

Government promises made, promises broken is certainly alive and well at CHNSRA. When contrasting the CHNSRA Enabling Legislation and what is happening today and when I read The Coastland Times article written by NPS Director Conrad Wirth in 1952 and compare his promises with today's NPS actions the question needs to be asked, "Where is the credibility in our government?" Our Native American friends experienced many similar government actions early in our history. A single case in point is the Treaty of Fort Laramie (1868). Current events at CHNSRA are recreationalists and Outer Banks residents Fort Laramie Treaty. Is it any wonder that the latest polls indicate only 17% of our population trusts government? Current NPS actions at CHNSRA contribute to this sad statistic.

I have come to realize these comments to the NPS are most often an exercise in futility. The final result will in all likelihood be decided by a judge. The Audubon Society and Defenders of Wildlife, et al will see to that. They don't contribute to the Seashore with beach cleanups, Ranger donations, etc, etc. They spend all their time in courts denying others enjoyment of the Seashore we love and have worked to preserve.

I close with a very sad heart. I know I have had the best of times early on at our National Seashores, but now my grandchildren will never be allowed to have the recreational opportunities I have enjoyed over many years. The saddest commentary is we are the people that have used, enjoyed and attempted to preserve these special places and now we are the ones who are denied access.

Because of NPS actions, I close with tears knowing I will never surf fish at Cape Hatteras again.

Correspondence ID: 13044 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hux, Lisa K
Received: May,10,2010 15:26:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Murray...
I believe the NPS preferred alternative will result in little (and perhaps no) value in making the Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore a park for the enjoyment of the citizens of this country. There is little (to no) attention given to providing a good "national park" experience. It is my understanding that United States citizens' tax dollars are paying for the park, yet these very "people" are being ignored.
The bird closures are unreasonable and there is no constructive provision for "working together" with the people - only dictating how the park is to be used. It is not a nature sanctuary.
Please pay attention to the rest of the Nature here on the planet..pay mind to the PEOPLE as well as you're attending to the "birds". It is the PEOPLE, the stewards of this planet, that you serve.
I am in favor of the "Coalition's" approach in the ongoing management of the Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13045 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:30:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't allow off road vehicles on the beaches of Cape Hatteras. When I go to the beach, I want peace, quiet and I don't want to have to move my blanket to get out of the way of cars. Also, the beach is such a fragile eco-system, I can't understand how it can be a good idea to allow off road vehicles to race across the beaches, sand and dunes of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Please continue to make our parks and shorelines safe for people, children, animals and the pristine beauty of nature.

Correspondence ID: 13046 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 15:34:11
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: 13047 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Ferraro, Joe
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Joe Ferraro 19 Windsor Glen Dr. Durham, NC 27703
Mr. Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
May 10, 2010
Supt. Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After thoroughly reviewing the NPS DEIS, I must disagree with any and all of the six alternatives within the document.

0012371

I have, however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups. These groups were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.

Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Sincerely,

Joseph A Ferraro, MS, ATC, LAT

Correspondence ID: 13048 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 15:36:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off Road vehicles do not belong in any of our parks. They destroy everything. The quite, the earth, the air. They do not belong.

Correspondence ID: 13049 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:37:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, and an employee in the service industry on the Mendocino Coast in California, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must 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.
Sincerely,
Jeffery Garcia

Correspondence ID: 13050 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Date: May 10, 2010
To: National Park Service
From: Sallie & Dennis Reese
Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments
We own 2 homes in Hatteras Village, NC. We are concerned about the potential impact on our property values and rentals due to the DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
Most of our comments are in agreement with those of Hatteras Realty, our management company. See below:
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]. No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: Carrying capacity would be a peak use limitdetermined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative F. I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.
4) Page 1: I agree with your statement ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors.
However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)
5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.
6) Page 121 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CANT get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two buffered ends.
I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.
Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.
The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledged rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! Its insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement protect and preserve natural and cultural resources appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fishermen want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

13) Pages 125; 392 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

14) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

15) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

16) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Lets scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying Protect, not Prohibit.

Thank you, Sallie & Dennis Reese 1640 Lozano Dr. Vienna, VA 22182

Correspondence ID: 13051 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Foster, S.
Received: May,10,2010 15:42:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

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

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

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

***** 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: 13052 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 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,

Edgar W. Bisson

Correspondence ID: 13053 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Seaman, Carol M

Received: May,10,2010 15:44:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reconsider proposal F DEIS Off Road Vehicle Management Plan. My 3 significant areas of concern are: 1. There should be access to all areas of the beach to pedestrians and ORV through a buffer zone or corridor through nesting areas on the Cape Hatteras Island south of Oregon Inlet coastline to the tip of Ocracoke. 2. By specifying a 300 meter area vs 1000 meter area and only during the actual nesting timeframes and not open-ended, everyone's interests can be accommodated. 3. There will be significant economic hardship to the residents and visitors to Hatteras Island if the plan as now suggested is implemented. I am fearful of the negative impact to housing values because of the decreased visitor population of fisherman and tourist expecting easy access to our pristine beaches. I also think a leash law for pets rather than restrictions eliminating their access is also sufficient. One of the joys of my relocating here was having permanent access to the beach and to walk at sunset or sunrise with my dog in tow. It is healthy for both of us. She is 12 years old and has NEVER bothered another living creature. Please just enforce the laws that you have on the books rather than make more restrictive ones. There is enough room on the beaches of Hatteras Island for all of us to be able to enjoy them. Please don't add any unnecessary restrictions. I am a firm environmentalist and believe we need to protect endangered species and nesting turtles. I also believe we can set up areas conducive to their interests without severely restricting the human population. Thank you considering all of our interests.

Best regards, Carol M. Seaman

Correspondence ID: 13054 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 15:45:16

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.

Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting

public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.

Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.

The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID:	13055	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Lugar, Michael					
Received:	May,10,2010 15:45:58					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	The beaches need to remain open to vehicles to keep both the area alive to businesses and give our children memories that will last. This is a family event not just a bunch of fishermen on the beach. WE SUPPORT OFF ROAD VEHICLES....					
Correspondence ID:	13056	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Byrd, Cynthia					
Received:	May,10,2010 15:46:46					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I grew up in North Carolina and spent many precious moments on its beaches with my grandparents, other family and friends, especially on the Outer Banks. Keep the OBX protected by not allowing recreational vehicles to drive on its beaches. And also help keep the Outer Banks, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, and other NC coastal beaches from eroding or becoming endangered so future generation of folks may enjoy its beauty. We should not lose a natural treasure for no good reason, or for ignorant pleasure. Thank you. Cynthia Byrd San Francisco					
Correspondence ID:	13057	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Dambach, Cheryl R					
Received:	May,10,2010 15:47:47					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I disagree with the 1000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure around any piping plover unfledged chick brood as stated on p. 121-127 of the ORV/DEIS alternative F. Only on Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational area would the 1000 meter closure in all directions(770 acres per brood) be imposed while other eastern areas maintain 200-300 meter distance. This inconsistency is unfair, unrealistic (770 acres) and discriminatory to anyone who uses the beach. To make it even more unbelievable is the fact that the piping plover is threatened-NOT ENDANGERED and it's natural nesting area is in Canada- NOT Cape Hatteras National Seashore. An alternative would be for the NPS to consider neighboring dredge and spoil islands that are part of the same ecosystem with less predator presence.					
Correspondence ID:	13058	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,10,2010 15:48:53					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, Please protect the sensitive ecosystem surrounding Cape Hatteras National Seashore by limiting off road vehicles. The Seashore The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on 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 there as a young girl and being enchanted by the pristine natural beauty. Please do everything you can to protect this special environment. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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 Beth Fielder					
Correspondence ID:	13059	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,10,2010 15:50:02					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D: *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a					

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13060 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:50:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13061 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:50:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13062 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:50:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13063 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:50:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13064 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:50:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13065 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
We began visiting the Outer Banks as children, and now take our children and grandchildren to enjoy and explore their natural beauty. Therefore, this alternative plan is important to us and would provide more opportunity for a wide variety of uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. My son was involved with a Piping Plover research project. I was able to volunteer some time and know how critical habitat protection is for their survival.
If Alternative D cannot be enacted, some basic guidelines are fundamental to any 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 be the primary concern, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased as necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13066 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: McKinney, Andrew S
Received: May,10,2010 15:51:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This letter is in reference to the Draft Environmental Impact Survey submitted by the National Park Service concerning ORV use and management of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I applaud the NPS for approaching the issue of balancing human access to the park and critical resource protection with an open mind and honorable intent. After reading through the Draft EIS, there are a few comments/suggestions that I would like to put forth:
1) On page 73 of the Draft EIS, research from Assateague Island is mentioned (Loegering 1992), which suggested a 225 meter buffer radius for nesting Piping Plover with unfledged chicks. The researchers observed flushing at a distance of 174 meters. Their recommended buffer of 225 meters amounts to a 30% larger area, which seems to be a reasonable size. I urge the National Park Service to adopt the 225 meter buffer radius for unfledged chicks, instead of the proposed 1000 meter buffer radius as noted in Table 10 on page 123, and Table 11 on Page 127. A 1000 meter buffer radius is more than four times larger than studies suggest is necessary.
2) The placement of new Ramps, Interdunal Roads, and parking areas to increase pedestrian and ORV access in non-SMAs is a great way to promote human access in less critical areas.
3) In Table 9 on page 119, the Consent Decree requires that buffer areas are expanded in size in the case of deliberate vandalism. I disagree with this practice because it effectively punishes the innocent public for the acts of a criminal.
Thank you for your consideration of my comments. Feel free to contact me if you need any further information.
Andrew S. McKinney PO Box 398 Avon, NC 27915 (252)995-4400

Correspondence ID: 13067 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:51:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid angler, who occasions the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV.
Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.
In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.
Regard,
Ross Reiley

Correspondence ID: 13068 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:54:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe the NPS preferred option (Alternative F) will provide adequate protection for species of conservation concern, but there were a few points I felt could use clarification or more specific language. My suggestions are below:
Pg. 108: Regarding carrying capacity requirements and periodic review. Will the density of cars (number per mile) only be reviewed, or will the method of figuring carrying capacity by density (as opposed to imposing an actual limit on total vehicles) be reviewed? And what will be the endpoints of the review (i.e., disturbance, population trends, habitat characteristics)?
Pg. 122: Piping plover nesting closures. Language states that a 75 m buffer will be established around nests outside existing closures. I would suggest language to automatically expand the buffer for nests inside existing closures if it is not at least 50 m (e.g., if birds nest close to the edge of existing closures). Then adjust based on observed bird behavior.
Pg. 122: Buffers around foraging piping plovers. The current language does not give a size for the buffer. I suggest 50 m, then adjust based on bird behavior as with nesting closures. But the intention should be made clear at any rate.
Pg. 123: Nonbreeding surveys. I would just add that the design should ensure specific sites are surveyed at multiple distinct tidal stages (low and high but also rising and falling). At CAHA this means taking into account not just predicted lunar tides but, because of wind effects, actual tidal height.
Pg. 124: Nonbreeding shorebird SMAs. Protecting important habitat is good, but a language should be included for buffering known foraging and roosting sites, similar to the language about buffering foraging sites in the breeding season. For instance, erect 50 m buffers around any place piping plovers were observed foraging or roosting at least twice in the nonbreeding season, until monitoring confirms the site is no longer used.

Correspondence ID: 13069 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:54:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family is one of the many families whose land was acquired by the Federal Government for the formation of The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. You were intrusted with our island beaches and with that the heritage of everyone who was born & raised on Hatteras Island. The NPS was to keep our beaches free & open for all, that was the deal. It was a contract the federal government (NPS) made with us, we certainly didn't go

out and solicit the government to come here and create an uninhabited bird sanctuary on the miles & miles of beaches that are here for all to enjoy. These beaches are now & have always been our lives, we have always respected, protected & coexisted with all wildlife that share our island home. Why has the agreement that was made with the original land owners been disregarded? It's like it never existed, so much that you would give more precedence to over zealous environmentalists, that have laid stake on our land & home, for a bird that isn't even indigenous (muchless endangered) to the island. The treatment of the local people should always remain first & foremost. These beautiful beaches are ours & for all who choose to share. We depend on these beaches being accessible to everyone fishermen, surfers, beachcombers, swimmers, boaters & yes even birdwatchers. They draw visitors that help provide jobs & sustain the local economy. Many of the local businesses have worked hard to establish themselves & these beach closures have been economically devastating, so with all due respect, if anything needs to be protected it's the PEOPLE and the HERITAGE of the Outer Banks. It's time to do the right thing, stand up and honor your contract with the people of Hatteras Island! Open up our beaches for all to enjoy. Make good on the original agreement. Keep your Word!

Correspondence ID: 13070 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 15:56:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Cape Hatteras National Seashore holds a unique ecological, recreational and economic value. I believe that beaches are a public resource and should be held in the public trust for their preservation.
Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides some of the best recreational resources on the East Coast, including surfing and fishing, but I recognize that if not regulated correctly ORV use may detrimentally affect migratory species that nest in the area. I believe that a balance between access and preservation can be achieved and that allowing continued access with improved management of ORV use to the National Seashore is the optimal solution for this area.
I support Alternative C, a balanced solution that benefits the animal species while guaranteeing humans can continue to enjoy and protect this most-precious coastal resource for years to come.

Correspondence ID: 13071 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.
Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.
Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.
The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.
I must not add that many people can not access certain areas because of physical limitations, including members of my own family. Mechanical access is important to us as I am sure it is to many other families. Please don't shut us out of our own country.

Correspondence ID: 13072 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:04:01
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: 13073 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:12:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Date: May 10, 2010
To: National Park Service
From: Michael and Carolyn Shearon
Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments
Our comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras

National Seashore Recreation Area. My wife and I have owned a vacation home in Avon, NC for fifteen years and have great concerns related to this plan.

1) Page 201: We disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]."

No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: We question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: We are against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". We disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: We agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: We disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. We strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

We propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. We believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. Also, the distance from the ocean high tide line to Highway 12 on most of Hatteras Island is less than 1,000 meters. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: We disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: We strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) We disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) We disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: We do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

As property owners we have great respect for the permanent residents and their way of life. The Hatteras Island community have always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period the local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of the island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: We strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

We believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended. As home owners that rent during the vacation season we have great concern this will drop our rental income significantly.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be

substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty thru which we rent our house.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: We strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 to July 31. Hatteras Realty, thru which we book our home, books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of vacation homes as pet homes encompass about 30% of rentals. We propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. We disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. We think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. We strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: We disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. We propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 to September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: We disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. We could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Michael and Carolyn Shearon

Correspondence ID:	13074	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	fernandez, ynez				
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Imagine yourself a Mother gopher trying to get your babies to sleep. They've drained your milk and you're starving but can't leave til they are sound asleep and Dad is back. Then here comes the terrible noise and the dull thud when the wheel hits Dad's head. Dad is not going back to the burrough...ever. How would you feel....Please stop stressing the wildlife. Isn't it enough for us that we've stressed out and unhinged each other and the environment?!? Do we have to ruin the lives of innocent wild life to get our kicks regardless of the pain it inflicts on others? Are we actually shameful infidels then as we are accused of being? Please direct your energies to proving that America is a great land where all life is honored and protected and nurtured. All life is counting on you.				

Correspondence ID:	13075	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	McNamara, Terry G				
Received:	May,10,2010 16:13:20				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Please, keep the Cape open to vehicles.				

Correspondence ID:	13076	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 16:16:04						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						

Correspondence: Off-Road Vehicles should be prohibited from public beaches and natural areas such as Cape Hatteras National Seashore and be confined to monitored tracks specifically designed for that purpose. Our national parks and seashores should be limited to foot traffic only in order to enjoy their natural settings. People should be encouraged to exercise and walk instead of using motorized transportation that is not Eco-friendly. ORVs cause considerable damage to plants and animals, as well as posing a danger to pedestrians. One cannot assume that an intelligent person will be operating an ORV and will confine himself to a designated trail. It's bad enough that we have a catastrophe currently at hand with the BP oil spill in the Gulf. Must man destroy all of our precious resources through careless inconsideration of our environmental legacy? Say no to off road vehicles. Enjoy nature the good old fashioned way. Go for a walk. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration of my comments.

Correspondence ID: 13077 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:16:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Superintendent Murray,
I am in agreement with Senator Marc Basnight and Representative Tim Spear when they suggest that viable alternatives and compromises exist to satisfy all interested parties in the beach access dilemma. We must all think outside the box to reach a mature outcome. The decisions made on behalf of animals that may not even be indigenous need not be all or nothing.
The Honorable Senator and Representative outline excellent solutions to the situation which I pray you will give serious consideration.
Respectfully, Warren Walton Animal Lover/Beach Access Supporter

Correspondence ID: 13078 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: GOODLING, JAMES
Received: May,10,2010 16:17:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern;
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Date: May 10, 2010
To: National Park Service
From:
Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments
My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]. No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: Carrying capacity would be a peak use limit determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront. If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closure rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative F. I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.
4) Page 1: I agree with your statement ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors.
However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)
5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.
Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.
6) Page 121 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CANT get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two buffered ends.
I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.
Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.
The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.
Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.
NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.
7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.
8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.
9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,
So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! Its insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement protect and preserve natural and cultural resources appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

As a lifelong resident of Hatteras Island, we of the Hatteras Island community have always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a negligible to moderate adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to adapt to the new rules.

(p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages. = No Pets in public areas beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 July 31.

Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Lets scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the publics right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying Protect, not Prohibit.

Thank you,
James& Susan Goodling (home owners for 10 years on Hatteras Island, vacationers on hatteras for the past 30 years) Kingspoint Dr. Frisco, NC

Correspondence ID: 13079 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Corner, Douglas H
Received: May,10,2010 16:18:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

I visit the Outer Banks for vacation. I enjoy the beach access it offers. I am even thinking of purchasing a home in Nags Head. If the ability to drive on the beach is denied. I will not move there or vacation there. I am familiar with bird sanctuaries in Florida. They used offshore islands for them and changed habitat off the beach for them. Why cant you do this? They also asked volunteers to mark turtle nests and bird nests. The citizens policed these areas and educated people of the meaning of the marks. The general public does respect nature. There are a few that never will! For these few make huge fines and have a civil beach patrol to help police and mark nests. I feel this is a power grab by a few in DC. Most people in DC only think this sounds like a good idea. They dont visit or live in the area. If beach access is denied? The economic impact will be huge for this area. Call we really afford to loose more job opportunities for a few "birds of concern"??? I am definitely against any limitations to beach access. The current controls are to much. Ask the people in the area to help solve this problem with you!!!!

Correspondence ID: 13080 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:20:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Dear Sirs,
My wife and I are long time owners of a home on Ocracoke (10+ years), part time residents and frequent visitors prior to that point. In addition my wifes family have been visiting the island since the 1930s and have many members of their extended family either living full or part time on the island. During that time the majority of the residents, visitors, native and migratory wildlife and lived and bred in relative harmony on what you have to admit is a national treasure much loved by all. Weathering storms, taking care of each other, the national seashore and surrounding waters without the need of the heavy hand of government, wildlife regulators and avoiding the hot heads who frequent other beaches to the north and south. So it is with great sadness we see all those years of stewardship, carefully building relationships with the locals, fishermen and the NPS, the education of new visitors by residents and long time visitors seemingly brushed aside by bureaucrats, lawyers, judges and those more interested in feathering their own nests rather than the wildlife they porport to protect, more interested in the letter than the spirit of any law. Adding regulations that seem to alienate everyone who previously worked so hard to keep the seashore safe while getting to enjoy and learn about its many moods. Silly things like bans on dogs on the beach when a stricter enforcement for the small minority who don't leash their dogs would make more sense. Total closure of beaches when limited access and selective closures make more sense. Better education and patrols rather than heavy handed rules and regulations. We all need to work together not be driven apart by petty arguments, it's the local people we need on the side of the seashore and all its residents as they have been in the past and are now if just given a bit of encouragement and I just don't see it happening, especially with 800 pages of regulations when 2 or 3 would do. I know that it tries to strike a balance and that is never an easy thing, such that no one is completely happy, but when no one is remotely happy then things fall apart in a hurry.
My suggestion is that you give the lawyers, regulators, and bureaucrats the day off, cut out everything written in legalese and have some common sense rules which protect not only the birds but also the human residents for which the outer banks is justly famous. With the overriding principle of "do no harm", strike a sensible balance, if the birds are nesting let them nest in peace but don't stop everyone else enjoying the beach, bringing their well behaved pets to enjoy the water etc. When turtles are nesting, I don't think anyone but a total idiot would want to disturb them so have extra patrols to catch those idiots but don't assume that everyone is so inclined. The outer banks is a wondrous place because there is a balance between nature and man built up over the centuries by people who understand and depend on that balance but once you start treating people like children rather than adults it is human nature to behave that way. Don't destroy what you have now because you can never get it back, and what you end up with is far worse.
Thank you

Correspondence ID: 13081 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:20:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

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

Correspondence ID: 13082 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:20:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13083 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:20:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13084 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:21:04
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, Stephenie Stephens

Correspondence ID: 13085 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Date: May 10, 2010 To: National Park Service From: Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and

enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas. 2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15. 4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc) 5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well. 6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. 7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access. 8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS. 9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%. So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park. 11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages ? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts. ? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI. On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement. I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended. Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial. Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts. Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible. 13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out. Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed. Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS. 14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection. 16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be

prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years. 17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area. Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates. 18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas. Conclusion: Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed. It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date. The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit." Thank you, =

Correspondence ID: 13086 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:22:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Murray: My husband, my family and I have been enjoying the hospitality of the Outer Banks for over thirty-years. We have treated the area with great respect as it has been such a part of our lives and our children's.
I feel the locals and visitors are having a great disservice put upon them and cannot understand the reasoning behind any beach closures to the extent that the island cannot be enjoyed for what it is. For many, many years nature and the public have enjoyed the island and lived harmoniously with no interference as is being forced upon everyone at this time. Mother Nature has at times destroyed everything in sight, much more so than any human encroachment that has been made to look like the undoing of all shore life.
I don't see why a happy medium cannot be reached with the input of those who truly know what the island stands for and what it means as far as the enjoyment of all concerned. It is not a nature conservatory, nor was it ever meant to be. Those areas are already designated. Why is it now so imperative that everything must be closed to even pedestrians choosing to just walk on your sandy beaches? How is that detrimental to any habitat all of a sudden?? Much of the land donated by many local families was for the enjoyment of those visiting, knowing full well the wildlife was an important part of everything as well. This has been going on for years and years and nothing has been endangered to the point of extinction that has truly been caused by using the beaches as they were intended, for the enjoyment of all.
The shores of your area certainly have seen an increase in vehicular traffic over the many years we've been visitors. Again, not nearly as destructive as Mother Nature herself and all have survived as was intended. The area is still beautiful, and can and should be able to be enjoyed by visiting fishermen, families just wanting to enjoy a truly special island. The locals, who have truly made the island what it is, I am sure, are wondering if they have any say in what's to be. It seems to fall on deaf ears and I cannot and have not heard anything or read anything that would justify what I see happening. If there was any rhyme or reason that would truly make sense, I would welcome reading it.
I am sure everyone involved would like to see something take effect that would be to everyone's benefit, not just certain groups. There has to be someone out there with the knowledge and expertise so everyone can be in a win-win situation, the island, the outsiders, the visitors, the locals. If everyone would just work together, what a great solution to all concerned and a benefit to the local economy in this most trying of times. Please know that the visitors to the island care and want to see the wildlife and also see our grandchildren and those to follow be able to experience what has been in the past.

Correspondence ID: 13087 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:29:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I wish to express my deepest concern regarding the Park Services Preferred alternative F. I am totally opposed to restrictions of access for ORVs and pedestrians especially during the designated seasons. The proposal will have a great impact on the way of life of all the citizens of this island, the economy of the area, the quality of life and the experience of visitors. Shutting down areas of the beach results in loss of jobs due to tourism. There will be few (with the exception of park service) who will not be affected. DOT employees, hyde county employees, health care employees as well as every other business that relies on tourist visitation will be reduce in size and numbers. While the park service will be guaranteed jobs (and probably increased numbers of jobs due to enforcement) the entire community will be reduced in work. The Outer Banks has thrived and, to my knowledge, lived in harmony with birds and other habitat. What good is it to have this beautiful environment if no one is there to enjoy it. Several of the birds species intended to be protected are interlopers, ie they are not endogenous to this area and I have yet to see a bird killed by on ORV. There are not any studies that show that ORVs are reducing numbers or that the restrictions which have been ongoing for the past two years are making any difference. The restrictions have demonstrated a decreased in tourism and the overall happiness of visitors and residents alike. The are ample nesting areas in dunes and on Portsmouth island as well as Pea Island. Perhaps the endangered species is the human race who has occupied this area for many generations. By closing down a great deal of the beach during the summer season, visitors are pressed together in small areas, that will lead to more undesirable and destructive behavior. Recent fishing tournaments - a positive effect on the economy - resulted in cramped anglers and very little beach on Ocracoke Island for any other tourists. I will use an analogy from scuba diving where uneducated individuals often destroyed the environments of the reef. Once educated, scuba diving and reef life and endangered marine lifeforms now thrive together. Education and reminder signage will decrease destruction and encourage better behavior of individuals on the Outer Banks. I would suggest turtle nests be relocated when in the ORV path, habitat for birds be constructed, scientific studies be conducted on habitat and support of nesting of endangered species and even perhaps some localized strategic closing of areas during known specified breeding periods. Closing land (beach) for long periods of time in the hopes that nesting will occur and without scientific studies to confirm hypothesis serves no one, except park service employees of course, and is overreacting. Enforce leash laws for animals, enforce speed limits, safe driving practices and use of alcohol on the beach. Please consider that the way of life and quality of life for the individual who has chosen to live and work here is more important than saving the beach from vehicular traffic. I support the positions of the Coalition for Beach Access. Alternative F is going way too far. If that alternative is selected, then the Park Service will essentially close the Outer Banks like it closed Core Banks and only the birds will be able to live here.

Correspondence ID: 13088 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:31:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family and I have had the great pleasure of enjoying the beaches at Cape Hatteras and would hate to see this national treasure damaged for the simple sake of "sport" or "entertainment" of a few.

Correspondence ID: 13089 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
 Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
 Correspondence Type: Web Form
 Correspondence:

May 10, 2010 To: National Park Service From: Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas. 2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15. 4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc) 5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well. 6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. 7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access. 8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS. 9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%. So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park. 11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages ? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts. ? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI. On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement. I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended. Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial. Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts. Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible. 13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out. Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed. Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small

Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS. 14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection. 16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years. 17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area. Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates. 18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas. Conclusion: Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed. It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date. The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The USPS needs to remember that they do not own the beaches, they are only allowed to use them as a GIFT FROM GOD!!! The proper balance is not achieved in the proposed DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit." Thank you, =

Correspondence ID: 13090 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: May 8th, 2010

Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 252-473-2111 x 148
Dear Mr. Murray:

I am writing to request that the National Park Service removes alternative A from the list of possible management plans for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. As stated in the purpose section of the plan, the goal is to develop a management plan that stipulates ORV use in a manner that will maintain the parks' resources. Being written as non-action plan negates the ability of this alternative to successfully accomplish the task.

The foundation of this plan is the buffer zones intended to protect the piping plover. However, there are many aspects within the written alternative that suggest this plan is flawed. To begin with, the frequently changing location of these zones often leaves visitors unaware of their current place. As a result, visitors unintentionally infringe upon the birds' habitat, damaging it. Although the park offers educational materials to prevent this, it often isn't adequate. Some visitors also knowingly ignore boundary signs.

Additionally, buffer zones aren't very effective at providing protection for the species. One of the necessary parameters to create a quality management plan is an accurate population count. Unfortunately, breaking the plover's habitat into segmented buffers presents a huge challenge in doing so, consequently underestimating the amount of space the specie needs. Furthermore, these buffers require impeccable timing in order to be useful, which also reduces their value.

The park service is planning to use these buffers for the management of the wintering/nonbreeding piping plover populations as well. These birds face all the above issues, along with other challenges admitted but not addressed within the plan. The first difficulty is the assumption that despite posted signs, the plover habitat will be disturbed and destroyed. The proposed solution is to further research the piping plovers patterns to decide the best protective measure. Not only will the population dwindle as researchers decide how to best protect the species, valuable habitat will also be destroyed. In light of Alternative A's lacking features, Alternative C is the more favorable, comprehensive, solution-oriented, environmentally friendly option. Instead of passively managing the seashore, this plan uses innovative actions to incorporate recreational uses into this sensitive environment. Relocating the ORV ramps to the less sensitive uplands will significantly reduce the negative impacts on the land, including piping plover habitat destruction. Although the construction of these ramps will cause some damages, the benefits far outweigh them.

An additional advantage of this plan is the replacement of the buffer zones with seasonal closings. These closings provide higher levels of protection to the endangered plovers because they allow a more consistent and enforceable boundary. Further land distinction also deters recreational users from violating signage and crossing onto protected property.

In summary, due to the dynamic nature of the buffers, Alternative A isn't well suited to provide adequate protection to the piping plovers. Recreational users are generally ignorant or unwilling to abide by the signs designated to limit ORV travel, thus destroying prime plover land. The seasonal closings offered by Alternative C are more likely to be obeyed and thus safeguard the birds' habitat and surrounding land. Since the latter option proposes a more holistic management plan, I encourage you to drop Alternative A and strongly consider Alternative C.

Sincerely, Kelly Winkelmeyer
kcfw66@mail.missouri.edu

Correspondence ID: 13091 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:36:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We love the Outer Banks and try to go there several times a year. Our enjoyment stems from the unspoiled beaches, its wildlife, and the crashing of the waves.

Of the alternatives presented, I prefer "environmentally preferred" Alternative D. According to the law, Cape Hatteras was established to be used primarily for primitive wilderness. The use of Off Road Vehicles (ORVs) is destructive and should only be allowed where its use will not harm wildlife.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I appreciate the hardwork of the National Park personnel for making sure our national treasures remain treasures.

Correspondence ID: 13092 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Smith, Richard B
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: May 10, 2010
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954

Dear Superintendent Murray:

On behalf of the Coalition of National Park Service Retirees (Coalition) we appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Representatives of the Coalition participated in the process for negotiated rulemaking leading up to this EIS. We believe that the negotiated rulemaking process, while not resulting in a product acceptable to all sides, served as a useful mechanism to allow the differing parties to fully develop and express their interests and concerns which were then used in the development of this EIS. Additionally, we commend park management and the NPS in their much-needed efforts to address the issue of off-highway vehicles at Cape Hatteras. The issue of beach driving at Cape Hatteras has been allowed to continue without required authorization or regulation for too long.

Document Adequacy

The document presents a full range of alternatives allowing for beach use as required under the National Environmental Policy Act, its implementing regulations and Department of the Interior and NPS standards. While a complete beach closure alternative scenario is not presented, such an analysis would not meet the stated purpose and need or management objectives described by the document.

The environmental analysis contained within the document represents a thorough and professional description of potential effects resulting from the alternatives. The document properly includes in the alternatives and the analysis provisions addressing species in addition to those species listed as threatened or endangered. The NPS Organic Act, Cape Hatteras enabling legislation, and the NPS Management Policies direct the preservation of native flora, fauna and natural processes. As a result, it is entirely appropriate that the plan and environmental analysis include provisions that take into account the presence of species of concern in the management of OHV use. Additionally, consideration of such species is consistent with the purpose and need as expressed in the document as well as the articulated management objectives for the plan.

Decision Standard

As the NPS moves forward in the decision-making process it is important to keep in mind the guiding legal precepts for any decision affecting NPS resources.

Any decision made must be in accord with the provisions of the Organic Act of the National Park System. While the 1916 Organic Act serves as the foundation of NPS administration, Congress further clarified the responsibilities of the NPS in with further legislative guidance. Under the provisions of 16 USC '1a1 Congress provided that:

"the national park system, which began with establishment of Yellowstone National Park in 1872, has since grown to include superlative natural, historic, and recreation areas in every major region of the United States, its territories and island possessions; that these areas, though distinct in character, are united through their inter-related purposes and resources into one national park system as cumulative expressions of a single national heritage; that, individually and collectively, these areas derive increased national dignity and recognition of their superb environmental quality through their inclusion jointly with each other in one national park system preserved and managed for the benefit and inspiration of all the people of the United States; and that it is the purpose of this Act to include all such areas in the System and to clarify the authorities applicable to the system. Congress further reaffirms, declares, and directs that the promotion and regulation of the various areas of the National Park System, as defined in section 1c of this title, shall be consistent with and founded in the purpose established by section 1 of this title, to the common benefit of all the people of the United States. The authorization of activities shall be construed and the protection, management, and administration of these areas shall be conducted in light of the high public value and integrity of the National Park System and shall not be exercised in derogation of the values and purposes for which these various areas have been established, except as may have been or shall be directly and specifically provided by Congress.

Thus, while the names of units administered by the NPS may differ in their classification as seashores, recreation areas, monuments or parks, the administration of the areas is carried out under a uniform standard. As stated in the Management Policies section 1.4.3, that standard "begins with the mandate to conserve park resources and values." Any decision made by the NPS needs to assure that such mandates are the foundation for any final determination concerning the operation of OHV vehicles at Cape Hatteras.

While the procedural provisions of NEPA have been closely adhered to during the development of this plan, the Coalition is concerned about the undue influence of local economic and political interests in the process. Local interests are often the most vocal and persistent in the planning process. However, in the end, Cape Hatteras is a unit of a national system and is recognized for its national significance. We note that the public meeting locations have centered around the area adjacent to Cape Hatteras and have not been held in areas of Northern Virginia or the metropolitan Washington DC area. These areas are home to many vacationers who enjoy the resources of Cape Hatteras as well as persons interested in the maintenance and survival of species and resources that may be influenced by OHV activity the park unit. We believe that a better cross section of the interested public could have been involved if public meetings were conducted in a broader geographic area.

Based on the above considerations, the Coalition urges the park to select Alternative D, the environmentally preferred alternative, as the option to be implemented.

We commend park managers for taking on the considerable task of developing a management plan for OHV use, and appreciate the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Richard B. Smith Chair Coalition of National Park Service 2 Roadrunner Trail Placitas, NM 87043 Tel: 505-867-0047 Cell: 505-259-7161 Email: rsmith0921@comcast.net

Correspondence ID: 13093 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 16:38:35
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.

Sincerely, Stephen Carl

Correspondence ID: 13094 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 16:41:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have visited Cape Hatteras many times and always thought that the arrangement that allowed selected portions of the Cape to be segregated from vehicular traffic was ideal. In talking to the many other visitors I encountered while there, I never -- I emphasize NEVER -- heard anyone complain to the contrary. The arrangement is not "broke", so do not try to fix it.

Correspondence ID: 13095 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Larson, Henry B
Received: May,10,2010 16:42:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The DEIS and its proposed plan for CAHA violate the very spirit of the Park's inception. I quote from Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes from 1938, "The people can no longer get to the ocean...except by permission of those who monopolize the ocean front...Call this ocean a national park, or a national seashore, or a state park or anything you please - I say the people have a right to a fair share of it." The recent actions forced upon NPS and the American people by greedy lawyers have and will further destroy the intent of the Park and have made a mockery of the Park Service. The Cape Hatteras Recreation Area was set forth for the people of the United States to use for reasonable recreational purposes, from swimming and fishing to simply walking their pet. However, the unscientific attacks by well funded outsider environmental groups has taken acres and miles of shoreline and their surrounding areas from the people and turned the Park into a wildlife preserve for a very few animals. Please require hard scientific study rather than take the word of rich lawyers. Please take into consideration the rights by law and precedent of the American people to enjoy the Park in its original intent. Please take into consideration the hundreds of thousands of tax payer dollars spent to overly protect a few birds - while purposely killing mammals which is utter hypocrisy. Please allow law abiding citizens to continue the right to walk their pet in front of and near the villages where they live. Enforce existing leash laws rather than banning pets. Law enforcement doesn't close a road because a few people may speed. NPS has proposed a ORV management plan based on the concept of negotiating rulemaking but the few environmentalist organizations on the committee refused to negotiate at all during the process. If NPS really wants to serve all parties, it must break the stanglehold on the Park by a few lobbyists and lawyers, use peer reviewed science to make its recommendations for management which will by course return the Park to the letter and spirit of its original intent.
Sincerely, Henry Brent Larson

Correspondence ID: 13096 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:43:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not have the time to thoroughly educate myself on this plan but I would like to express the importance of ORV access to me and my family. Most recently my family and I visited Okracoke Island. One of our favorite aspects of the trip was the beach.. (go figure). We were able to drive our 4x4 Suburban on the beach, park, and enjoy. It was November and accept for several other fishermen and their vehicles the beach was empty. It was one of the best beach experiences I remember. We can't wait to go back and part of what made it so great was being able to drive on the beach. I would not be going back if that was not available. Please figure out away to keep the animals safe but also allow people to enjoy the beach in a responsible way.

Correspondence ID: 13097 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Spangler, Robert C
Received: May,10,2010 16:43:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: After reading the plan with all its options,I must disagree with these options.The ORV routes are extremely restrictive while the bird closures are extremely excessive. I can not find solid scientific data supporting the size of the closuers for the birds as well as the increased closure area for the turtles. As an Environmental Scientist, who has worked with endangered species and habitat modification, I understand the need for the protection of species but fail to see the need for the extreme measures being taken in the park.Since the data indicates the birds are in their southern most range of their habitat, increasing the closure area will do little if any to increase their overall population. Any first year Environmental Science student knows, these birds occupy the flatter ends of the population bell curve and that in itself becomes the limiting factor to increased the overall population.Although the birds can not read a graph,the data from the graph tell us that very little if any increase in the population will occur. If some one does read this, I thank you for your time and consideration.
Bob Sapngler MS Environmental Science

Correspondence ID: 13098 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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 (Off-road vehicles), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason. "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: 13099 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: ALLARD, GARY L
Received: May,10,2010 16:48:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation. Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources.
 Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.
 Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.
 The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13100 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:50:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13101 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:50:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13102 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:50:16
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: 13103 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:50:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13104 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:50:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13105 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:50:22
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.

Yours truly,
Susan E. Porter

Correspondence ID: 13106 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:50:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13107 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:56:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation. When we visit the Cape Hatteras area we look forward to riding atvs . Please don't take away our riding areas we use while vacationing . We'll be forced to vacation elsewhere where atvs are given an opportunity to ride . Thank you JB

Correspondence ID: 13108 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Ellis, M-F
Received: May,10,2010 16:57:00
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 use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches.
Efforts to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant are essential.
The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities to conserve Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife, which must take precedence over Off Road Vehicle recreation.
Cape Hatteras must be permanently preserved as a primitive wilderness and protect wildlife recovery.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the 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: 13109 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:57:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom it may concern. I am submitting a comment relating to the DEIS study. My family and I have lived here for 19 years and still don't quite understand the over reaction by more than a few to destroy our livelihoods and wreck our way of life. Reasonable protection is a must for the future of all next generations, but over the boundary limitations to insure this protection is not the answer.

I encourage you to have a second, third, even fourth look at the serious impact your Alternative F will have on this already economically fragile Island(s).

There is no doubt, as we have already felt the negative impact, that your favored alternative will help to run others off the Island and others to close their family businesses. Isn't the National economy in enough danger that it would be critically dangerous to offer another significant section of unemployed persons to the Government?

We all hope there will be a much more favorable decision reached by the end of the year. Meanwhile, we are forced to struggle through another round of beach closures, damaging the natural landscape with the "closed" signs and ropes streaming all along Highway 12. Isn't there some concern for altering the National Seashore with all the hardware?

1)I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%, So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

2)I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

3)Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. 4)Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection. It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

Thank you, Sheila Collie

Correspondence ID: 13110 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, Ingrid
Received: May,10,2010 16:58:10
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: 13111 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 16:59:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This whole imbroglgio is a bureaucratic activity well past the intent of Congress in passing the law that created the National Seashore and Recreational area.. The proposed restrictions are based on poor Science unsupported by peer review. The whole purpose of the RECREATIONAL AREA was to preserve the shore for RECREATIONAL use by all citizens, not to create an untouchable wilderness for the benefit of creatures that are NOT endangered. Anthony E. Bisantz

Correspondence ID: 13112 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: (1) After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Poaition Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing

the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. (2)I disagree with the extreme buffers outlined in DEIS pages 121 to 127. They must be modified to substantially reduce the minimum 1,000 meter buffer in all directions required in Alternative F for unfledged Piping Plover chicks. Dare County believes a more appropriate and yet effective buffer is 200 meters. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. (3) I agree with the Coalition for Beach Access position statement on the DEIS. I do not believe the DEIS adequately addressed the cultural significance of access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

Correspondence ID: 13113 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Vines, Stuart S
Received: May,10,2010 17:01:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My biggest concern is the livelihood and well being of the residents of Hatteras Island. The economic impact has and will continue to be unbearable for a growing number of them. The impact study should have focused on the island itself rather than all of Dare County. By including the whole Co., a skewed image is presented which does not reflect the true impact on the islander. The provisions for buffers at bird nest is another more specific concern. Unrealistically larger buffers are prescribed in the plan. For all the research I have done on these, I can find no scientific data that supports or recommends buffers of this size. Apparently the size is an arbitrary size which is many times larger than those used in any of the NPS holdings where Piping Plovers nest. There should be consistency in the provisions for the nesting birds and not just choosing a size in a non scientific manner.

Correspondence ID: 13114 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: (1) After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. (2)I disagree with the extreme buffers outlined in DEIS pages 121 to 127. They must be modified to substantially reduce the minimum 1,000 meter buffer in all directions required in Alternative F for unfledged Piping Plover chicks. Dare County believes a more appropriate and yet effective buffer is 200 meters. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. (3) I agree with the Coalition for Beach Access position statement on the DEIS. I do not believe the DEIS adequately addressed the cultural significance of access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

Correspondence ID: 13115 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Grund, Blake R
Received: May,10,2010 17:09:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Mike Murray Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Mr. 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 rule making process. This document succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. I believe it should be adopted in its entirety. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Sincerely, Blake R. Grund

Correspondence ID: 13116 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Grund, Suzanne K
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Mike Murray Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Mr. 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 rule making process. This document succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. I believe it should be adopted in its entirety. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Sincerely, Suzy Grund

Correspondence ID: 13117 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Mike Murray Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Mr. 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 rule making process. This document succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. I believe it should be adopted in its entirety. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Sincerely, Amy Grund

Correspondence ID: 13118 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wheelless, Karen S
Received: May,10,2010 17:12:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Mike Murray, Supt. Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Supt. Murray:
Please accept this letter as my additional comments on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have however, reviewed the 77-page Coalition for Beach Access 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.
In addition, issue all through the discussion of access, from negotiated rulemaking through the Park Service public comment meetings, has been whether or not birds that are not federally protected should be afforded large buffers and pre-nesting and nesting closures.
The piping plover is the only bird on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is listed under the federal Endangered Species Act. The other birds that get special treatment are listed only as "species of special concern" by the state of North Carolina.

Many people have written about this and commented on the issue at negotiated rulemaking. It also has been singled out in comments that access proponents have made during the NPS public meetings and in their comments.

State Sen. Marc Basnight and Rep. Tim Spear addressed this issue head on in their comments to the Park Service on the DEIS.

They asked why state-listed species of special concern are getting protected under the DEIS and Alternative F and why the Park Service will not recognize the entire ecosystem when counting these birds. Many of them are nesting in great numbers on dredge spoil islands just a stone's throw from the seashore.

Here is an excerpt from the Basnight/Spear comment:

"Another confusing issue in the buffers listed in the DEIS is the equal and even more protective status given to species not on the endangered species list. Birds listed as North Carolina species of concern should not be given protected status under the Endangered Species Act. We have spoken with both the Chairman and Executive Director of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission regarding this matter. Both have informed us that these unnecessary protections were never the intent of the Commission's participation in this process, nor a requested outcome. They have also informed us that other species of concern are not given ESA status on other federal lands. Pre-nesting closures should be exclusively for the piping plover, the only federally listed threatened bird species. Also, non-ESA listed birds should not have buffers of 300 meters. The county feels a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. We also spoke with NCWRC regarding the inclusion of all birds in the ecosystem being counted when doing any type of management plan. Currently, birds on dredge spoil islands located adjacent to the Park are not being included in the population figures. They agree these islands have no predation and are ideal locations for nesting. To not include the populations of these islands is disingenuous to the intent of this process."

According to Gordon Myers, executive director of the Wildlife Resources Commission, confirmed in a telephone interview that he is working on DEIS comment for that agency that will request that the state species of special concern not be given the same status as federally listed birds.

"These restrictions on the use of public land have never been our intent," he said.

He added that what the Park Service has proposed in the DEIS is not what the agency is asking for.

He also said that the agency thinks that the entire ecosystem should be considered when assessing the health of bird populations.

He says that the Park Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Wildlife Resources Commission, which all do bird counts, need to coordinate their efforts to give a composite picture of populations in the area ? not just focus on birds on the seashore.

The birds listed under the state's species of special concern should be protected ? as they have been for decades on Hatteras Island. But there is no reason that a federal agency should grant them equal protection with federally listed birds under the ESA.

Trim back those buffers.

WHAT ABOUT PEA ISLAND?

Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge is managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, separately from the Park Service management of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

But the refuge is located on Hatteras Island within the seashore.

So why, access advocates ask, are the refuge's 12 miles of Hatteras Island beach not counted by the Park Service or environmental groups as part of the area that is closed to ORV access?

These are, and have been for years, 12 miles of the island set aside for pedestrian-only access.

One 12-mile long wildlife refuge is enough in the seashore.

PERMITS FOR BEACH FIRES AND IN THE VILLAGES ONLY?

Bonfires on the beach are a tradition for many islanders and visitors to Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Beach fires have been limited by the night driving restrictions under the consent decree ? you must be off the beach by 10 p.m. from May 1 ? Sept 15.

However, under Alternative F, campfires would be allowed during the turtle nesting season from May 1 ? Nov. 15 ONLY in front of the Hatteras Island villages, Coquina Beach, and the Ocracoke Day Use Area.

A non-fee education permit would be required year-round for a beach fire.

This restriction has the practical effect of limiting beach fires to only those who rent the first row of expensive oceanfront homes on Hatteras Island.

At Coquina Beach and at the Ocracoke Day Use Area, I guess you could carry all your firewood over the dunes and down to the beach.

But on Hatteras Island, if you could build fires only in the villages, the Park Service would be putting them off limits to all but oceanfront owners or renters. There are few, if any, areas for people to park and even carry their wood to the beach in the villages.

I agree with the positions held by these organizations: - Coalition for Beach Access Coalition's 77-page position paper on the DEIS - Dare County's position paper and comments on the DEIS - Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce comments on the DEIS - Marc Basnight and Tim Spear comments on DEIS

Respectfully submitted,

Karen Wheelless American Citizen

Correspondence ID:	13119	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 17:12:57						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I liken the idea of closing public access to beaches to putting 3 Navy Seals on trial for the alleged physical abuse of a TERRORIST detainee who had recently killed 4 Americans. Why that even happened (the trials) is totally beyond me. It didn't make sense. Same as this attempt to close public beaches to save a species of bird which is not extinct or even close to extinction. It doesn't make sense. I guess the next move is to ban people from enjoying their yards because bluebirds and cardinals and finches and the rest of the birds in the wild use these yards to mate and nest. What's the difference? I have yet to hear a valid reason, and I can't believe that MY government chooses to "strong-arm" it's people in such a way. Because, that is exactly what this is. I am very disappointed in our government. In fact, you all make me sick!!!						
Correspondence ID:	13120	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Mr. Mike Murray Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Mr. 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 rule making process. This document succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. I believe it should be adopted in its entirety. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Sincerely, Molly Grund						
Correspondence ID:	13121	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	
Name:	Adams, Gayla B						
Received:	May,10,2010 17:15:45						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Historically I have stayed in the spectator gallery & allowed others to tilt at windmills & fight for causes & then complained when things did not happen as I felt they should. No more. I started coming to Hatteras National Seashore in the mid 80's. Our children grew up coming to the Outer Banks every summer. The first time we ever drove on the beach, we rented a very old suburban in Buxton we fondly called the Black Knight..that opened up a whole						

new world! I saw the "Point" for the very first time, we went to the Hatteras Inlet and crabbed as the ferrys to Okarcoke went back & forth, we spent whole days on South Beach swimming & fishing, sometimes not seeing anyone other than near the camp grounds. Since that time, we have invested in 4-wheel drive vehicles with which we have enjoyed access to the many beautiful beaches for many years. We respect the bird nesting areas, the turtle nests, the dunes. We pick up trash. Those folks we know who have also enjoyed open access to the beaches have done the same Closing the beaches to mollify a minority will again, as so often these days, be to the detriment of many. I advocate the protection of wild life..the beauty of the National Seashore is a testament to the wild life that inhabits it. I believe that wild life & humans can coexist if we act responsibly. I believe the proposed solutions by environmental groups are too extreme. Please do not take away this beautiful, last accessible wild area on the Atlantic coast.

Correspondence ID: 13122 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 17:17:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hasn't our land especially the beaches been devastated enough. Why must the protection that some do have, constantly be under threat of undoing? Of backtracking? None of which do the land any good. It's always an undoing of any good that may have been in place. PLEASE, do not undo any good that protects the land, wildlife and plants of this beach. I personally have never been to this area but will finally be able to visit in Sept. and Oct. I hope that my visit will be one in which I know that your organization protected this land. Thank you, Lee

Correspondence ID: 13123 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative 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 visit the Outer Banks at least twice each year, and providing an environment in which wildlife can thrive is important to me. North Carolinians are blessed to have beaches and mountains to enjoy, but we'll continue to enjoy them only if we take the responsibility of following policies that preserve habitat.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore. North Carolina needs to listen to the voices of its scientists and then assure protection of breeding grounds. This issue will have a direct impact on the beach my one-year-old granddaughter will enjoy. Give her a chance to see the wildlife that makes our beaches the best places--for families and for wildlife.

Correspondence ID: 13124 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 17:20:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13125 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 17:20:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13126 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 17:21:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Don't let it happen!

Correspondence ID: 13127 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 17:24:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 May 10, 2010
Dear National Park Service My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas. 2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15. 4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."
However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc) 5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well. 6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. 7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access. 8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS. 9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%. So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.
10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil islands that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National

Park. 11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues. As a 20 year resident of Hatteras Island, we have always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period both local and rental people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities. 12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages ? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts. ? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI. On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement. I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended. Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial. Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts. Over the last 5 years our rentals have consistently been substantially reduced. Our family has held on to our properties on Hatteras Island at a considerable cost and sacrifice. We have had to forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice family activities in order to maintain our rental properties. If the proposed changes go into effect, we may be forced to sell and leave Hatteras Island. Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible. 13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out. Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed. Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS. 14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "?prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31. As I pet owner, I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs. 15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection. 16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years. 17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area. Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates. 18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas. Conclusion: Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed. It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date. The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit." Thank you,
Jennifer Rodriguez

Correspondence ID:	13128	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 17:24:43						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.</p> <p>Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.</p> <p>Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.</p>						

The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13129 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, N/A

Received: May,10,2010 17:27:51

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 May 10, 2010
Dear National Park Service My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas. 2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15. 4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc) 5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well. 6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. 7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access. 8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS. 9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%. So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park. 11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues. As a 20 year resident of Hatteras Island, we have always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period both local and rental people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities. 12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages ? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts. ? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI. On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement. I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended. Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial. Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts. Over the last 5 years our rentals have consistently been substantially reduced. Our family has held on to our properties on Hatteras Island at a considerable cost and sacrifice. We have had to forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice family activities in order to maintain our rental properties. If the proposed changes go into effect, we may be forced to sell and leave Hatteras Island. Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible. 13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage

of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out. Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed. Why would a group of surf fishermen want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS. 14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31. As I pet owner, I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs. 15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection. 16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years. 17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area. Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates. 18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas. Conclusion: Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed. It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date. The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit." Thank you,
Yvonne Rodriguez

Correspondence ID: 13130 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 17:29:50
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: 13131 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 17:30:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.

Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.

The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13132 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
The National Parks Conservation Association, of which I am a member, developed an excellent commentary on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I will follow with that commentary. However, my most important point is that, in most cases, ORV use in National Parks is inconsistent with the preservation of what makes these places special to begin with. It also seriously impinges on the enjoyment of virtually every other type of visitor.
The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 13133 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Nitsch, Jessica M-E
Received: May,10,2010 17:30:46
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, Jessica M-E Nitsch

Correspondence ID: 13134 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Clark, Patricia
Received: May,10,2010 17:35:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel that dogs should be restrained by a 6 foot leash in the dune areas. At the surf zone, however, I feel that dogs should not need to be leashed if they are under control of their owner. Dogs in the water certainly present a greater danger to the owner and themselves when leashed than when unleashed.

Correspondence ID: 13135 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the assessment made by NPS that: "Visitor experience could be affected by conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreation users." (p. vi).
I agree with the need to ask the question: Why has NPS never made public a list of reported incidents? Because ? In 10 years, only 1 minor incident involving a stuck vehicle and a pedestrian was disclosed. The driver was not blamed by those involved, nor was he charged. (p. 268)
I disagree with the statement made by NPS: Shorter Off-Season ORV access on South-facing Villages (p. xix)
I agree that the question needs to be asked: Why are Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages closures to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages? (p. 23)
I agree with the statement by NPS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" (p. xxiv)
But I also agree then the question needs to be asked: Why is capacity more restrictive on Bodie Island and Ocracoke than at Cape Point? (p. xxiv). (Bodie Island & Ocracoke -260 vehicles per mile and Cape Point ?400 vehicles per mile). This seems to be in conflict with the earlier assessment made by NPS regarding "Carrying Capacity". I also agree that the question needs to be asked of the NPS: Why do ORV counts provided for Memorial Day and July 4, 2009 which state: "ramp 4: includes Bodie Island Spit" and "ramp 43 to ramp 49: includes Cape Point" fail to recognize Bodie Island Spit

and Cape Point were closed to ORV access on these dates due to resource protection closures, which thereby increased ORV congestion at ramps 4, 43, 44, and 49? (p. 265)

I disagree with the assessment by NPS: "Because it is not administered by the NPS, the seashore cannot direct the visitor use at Pea Island NWR." (p. 1)
I agree with asking the question: Why does NPS refuse to acknowledge that Pea Island is a prime, pedestrian-only area for visitors to the seashore and overstate the need for more ORV free areas? By eliminating this vast stretch of beach which is already off limits to ORV access it makes the beach parcels they intend on closing look like a smaller percentage of the overall resource area under closure to ORV.

I agree with the DEIS descriptions of ORV access as historical in nature (pg. 83) and also both predating the Seashore and as being integral to the public use by both residents and visitors. The document also illustrates and captions historical commercial fishing (pg.18), historical recreational fishing (pgs. 15, 260) and historical general recreational activities (pg. 259). These same traditional cultural activities are featured on the front cover.

I disagree with the NPS failure to appropriately address the traditional cultural value of surf zone access. I disagree because the NPS failure stands in direct violation of its legal responsibility under Section 106 of the NEPA and the NEPA framework as a whole. Isn't it ironic that the DEIS has a collage of pictures on the very first depicting surf fishing and ORV usage, but all this 810 page document does is limit the access based on false science.

I disagree with the NPS definition that Large, Inflexible Buffers be used, (p. 121-127) because they are too large, too restrictive and do not allow for ORV pass-thru only corridors

I agree with the opinion that:

? buffers use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access is always maintained

? Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded

I disagree with the overall assessment made by NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies Address because the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival with Little Chance to have more than Negligible Impact, AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to Non-human Events. ?for example:

? Mammalian Predation: 54% Highest Impact ? Storm / Lunar Tides: 29% ? Nest Abandonment: 6% ? Avian Predation: 5% ? Ghost Crab Predation: 3%
? Human Interference: 3% Insignificant Impact

I disagree with how NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem. They did not consider:

? Villages, dredge and spoil islands, Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge

? Dredge and spoil islands typically have fewer predators to threaten nesting birds

? Bird activity within neighboring areas should be tracked and included in target productivity levels. Fluctuations and trends in Recreational Area bird populations should be viewed relative to regional and state experiences ?not in isolation.

I agree that all locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem and should have been considered.

I disagree with the NPS: Around the clock closure from nest to surf line (p.125) from May 1 ?November 15th. If the area is closed around the clock from the nest to the surf line, it cuts off all access. Closing all the way to surf line blocks access to the entire beach. It would be better managed if the access were allowed to pass below the nest near the surf.

I agree with a Closure to surf line from 1 hour before sunset until dawn, monitored by Turtle Night Nest Watch Team because the proposed Night Driving Restrictions Penalize Pedestrian and ORV users. Education and awareness are the most beneficial to all parties involved. Simply eliminating access is not "managing" the resource. And the resource is supposed to be available to all parties.

I disagree with the NPS barriers 105 meters wide (p.125) this cuts off all access and one nest at the beginning of two consecutive ramps would block the entire section of beach between the two ramps. This does not take into account all of the beach between two different nests that are cut off completely because the blockage is all the way to the surf line leaving zero passage. I agree with the statement that "Closure should be 10 meters square during the day" This is a more effective way to allow for access. The plan should cover off-road vehicle access, not total off-road vehicle elimination. Eliminating access is not "managing" it.

I disagree with the Prohibition of PETS in the seashore during bird breeding season, including in front of the villages."(p136)= No pets in public areas- beaches, campgrounds, sound-front, foot trails, park maintained roads from March 15 -July 31.

It is perfectly acceptable to have dogs tethered utilizing the six foot leash rule.

I disagree with the NPS position: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." (p. 210)

I agree with facts related to current ORV access that:

? No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs.

? ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve.

? Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations.

I also agree that the question needs to be asked of the NPS: Why are buffers and closures administered such that more people are forced into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience?

I disagree with the socioeconomic data and analyses in the DEIS (pg 270-281;561-598) because it results in misleading and sometimes erroneous conclusions and is directly manifested in both the Effected Environment and Socioeconomic Impact sections. Critical weaknesses in the analyses pertain to:

1) Statistical definition of the Region of Influence (ROI); 2) Incomplete visitation/business survey data (p.566); 3) Erroneous recreational user data; 4) inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use; 5) Flawed key assumption concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative The definition that ROI incorporation of the Northern Beach communities, including Southern Shores and Duck is misleading. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore

The inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the Seashore Villages.

The analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

Why is it OK to include all of these extraneous areas when it comes to Region of Influence (ROI); but NOT ok to include the populations of birds that exist on the dredge islands?

I disagree with the NPS: Use U shaped light filter fence to orient hatchlings

I agree with a proposed "Use Pea Island style keyhole pattern fence to the surf line at night".

I disagree with NPS that : "ORV and other recreational use would have long-term major adverse impacts on sea turtles due to the amount of Seashore available for ORV use and by allowing nighttime driving on the beach." (p. 377)

I agree with the assessment that "Major Adverse" (NPS definition, p.369) events have not occurred at the Recreational Area ?Night Driving Restrictions are not Necessary because: ? Nesting females have not "been killed"

? Complete or partial nest lost due to human activity has not "occurred frequently"

? This is all conjecture on the part of NPS. There is no documented evidence to support their accusations. They are merely speculating on a worst case scenario. Education and awareness are the best tools for the job here. An educated informed public addresses the true spirit of "managed" resource as opposed to total elimination of beach access, which requires no "management". ? Hatchling disorientation/disruption due to humans have not "occurred frequently" ? Direct hatchling mortality from human activity has not "frequently occurred" ? Pro-active Turtle Night Nest Watch program will insure no ORV impact.

I disagree with the position that NPS will not Adopt More Proactive Techniques Used at Other East Coast Locations to Encourage Turtle Nesting Success.

I agree with the assessment that NPS Inadequately Addresses Environmental Issues More Detrimental to Turtle Recovery Success than ORVs or Pedestrians (p. 392-396) because:

? 38.5% of nests had 0% hatchlings due to weather events. (p. 87, p. 219) ? 2009 Loggerhead Recovery Plan calls this catastrophic

? False crawl statistics do not support theory that light pollution is a significant problem at the Recreational Area. (p.125, p. 219)

? Predator management and nest enclosure practices encourage ghost crabs which are a primary predator of turtle eggs and hatchlings
 I disagree with NPS usage of The North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission Relocation Guidelines.
 I agree with an assessment that the North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission Relocation Guidelines are Inadequate because:
 ? Recreational Area and the State have lost 55% and 60% of Leatherback nests respectively over the past 10 years following these guidelines.
 ? Use of "average high tide line" (as used in other states) rather than "seaward of debris line marking spring high tide" to identify which nests to relocate leave many nests at risk.
 I disagree with the management decisions reflected in the DEIS that show a clear bias to implement actions that will adversely affect the visitor experience but to avoid actions that would benefit both natural resources and visitors. For instance:
 ? The NPS says it is OK to replace South Point wetlands with parking area because beach will be closed to ORVs.
 ? The NPS says it is OK to relocate Turtle Nests when storms are imminent, but not before (coincidentally the high risk nests are in prime ORV corridors).
 ? The NPS says it is OK to set aside areas of beach to replant the "extirpated" seabeach amaranth, but not OK to clear vegetation at Cape Point ponds to create more favorable piping plover habitat (outside of the prime ORV corridor).
 ? The NPS says it is OK to kill predators (greatest risk to birds and turtles), not OK to drive on the beach at night (deterrent to predators, low risk to turtles and birds).
 I disagree with the NPS assessment of Restrictive Species Management Areas (p. 468) Where they state:
 NPS: Established based on annual habitat assessment. NPS: Manage each SMA using ML1 or ML2 procedures. NPS: ML1 ?No pedestrian or ORV access during entire breeding season NPS: ML2 ?pedestrian only corridor thru SMA at Bodie Island Spit NPS: ML2 -pedestrian & ORV corridor thru SMA at Cape Point, South Point
 I agree with the opinion that: ML1 is overly restrictive. Pedestrian and ORV corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding & nesting season (within guidelines) to maintain access.
 I disagree with the NPS assessment of Limited Pedestrian and ORV Corridors (p. 468) because:
 NPS: Only recognized in ML2 managed SMAs NPS: SMA management reverts to standard buffers when bird breeding activity first observed
 I agree with the opinion that:: Pedestrian and ORV corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.
 In conclusion:
 I disagree with the NPA proposed Alternative F restrictions because they far exceed those under the Consent Decree, the Interim Management Strategy, and the de facto ORV plan previously in place under Superintendent's Order #7.
 I disagree with the speakers at the public hearings being limited to three minutes to address an 810 page document!!!
 Supposedly the Park Service has budget issues. Have they published the cost of doing this do called impact? I disagree with this 810 page document even being called the DEIS. Since when did it become DEIS? It's supposed to be an off-road vehicle management plan. The title includes Cape Hatteras National Seashore and it includes the word off-road vehicle management plan. So why is it referred to as D(draft) EIS. Why is it referred to as CHNSORVMPEIS?

Correspondence ID: 13136 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lavis, Robert J
Received: May,10,2010 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,
 Rob Lavis

Correspondence ID: 13137 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Snow, Joel F
Received: May,10,2010 17:39:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I'm in favor of allowing vehicle beach access and submit the following:

The Coastal Conservation Association North Carolina wishes to comment on the recently released Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the ORV Management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area issued by the National Park Service. The objective of CCA is to conserve, promote and enhance the present and future availability of these coastal resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the general public. As such the thousands of members and volunteers of CCA NC and their nearly three quarters of a million associated recreational anglers are very disappointed in the six options for ORV management on CHNSRA. First of all the document itself is very difficult to follow in its 800+ pages. The tragedy is that none of the six options reflect the wishes of the vast majority of the CHNSRA visiting public and CCA NC. While there are preferred environmental and NPS options, there is no pro-access preferred option. The CHNSRA was established specifically for the American public to enjoy the seashore. To propose no option which provides a maximum access option certainly violates the spirit and perhaps the letter of the laws establishing this national park. Without serving the visiting public, The NPS has failed in its responsibility to our citizens. All the options presented in the DEIS seek to restrict public access well beyond any reasonable or legal requirement.

It is clear that significant facts have been ignored in the preparation of this DEIS. The success of turtle nesting and piping plover nesting and fledging is virtually unchanged since the de facto ORV plan was implemented in 1978. The primary causes of failed nesting and fledging are overwhelmingly predation and weather events which have occurred for hundreds of years. ORV caused mortality is a fraction of 1%. The USFWS and NPS personnel have caused more plover mortality. Yet, the NPS chooses to attack those users who are very sensitive to the wildlife in the CHNSRA.

The DEIS options all include restrictions which, when implemented as they have been under the consent decree, will unnecessarily close miles and miles of beach access both from the ocean and sound side. The many options describe no action which can circumvent a nesting closure in order to access an open area of the beach. Thus, while a stretch of waterfront may be "open" it is inaccessible. This represents nothing more than verbal trickery and masks the true available waterfront.

The specifics of option F, the NPS preferred option, require at least some comment as commenting on all options would extend beyond the available space and time constraints. Overall, the DEIS suggests there would be 52 of 68 miles of the waterfront "open" to ORV access but it is not clear that this includes any calculation of sound side access for ORVs or pedestrians. CCA NC strongly believes the "buffer" or closure areas suggested for piping plovers in various stages of nesting and fledging are beyond excessive. For nesting piping plovers 50 meters is more than adequate and as is 200 meters for unfledged chicks. To suggest that unfledged chicks of a bird that is less than 1 foot tall requires over a mile of seashore is ludicrous! All this with no pass through or corridor around these areas closes vast areas of the CHNSRA to the American public. All other shore birds should be allocated no more than 30m for nesting and 30m for unfledged chicks with pass through corridors as there is no legal requirement to provide excessive buffers. In addition, the NPS fails to recognize the role played by the spoil islands behind Bodie Island, Hatteras Island, Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge and Ocracoke Island in the breeding of shore birds. These areas are typically with a few hundred yards of the CHNSRA and harbor large populations of shore birds. If the NPS truly wants to help the population of piping plovers they should investigate the usage of large cages placed around the nests to keep predators out of the nests. These are used in the Northeast where the major piping plover nesting takes place. The NPS and the USFWS seem content to kill hundreds of other wildlife to try to protect piping plovers but refuse to implement simpler techniques improve shore bird breeding success while improving access as well.

Option F describes measures required to "improve turtle breeding success". Many of the restrictions described in option F have little basis in peer reviewed science. For example, there is no evidence that night driving of ORVs has any impact on turtle nesting or hatchling survival. There have been no female turtles killed by ORVs. To protect turtle nests and improve hatchling success, CCA NC recommends relocation of turtle nests when they are laid in areas exposed to weather events. Using the fences used on the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge that are keyhole shaped are more effective for turtle hatchlings and would allow continued use of ORVs at night.

The surf zone of CHNSRA has been used for a hundred years for the purposes of swimming, sunbathing, fishing, birding and shelling. ORV usage is critical to the pursuit of these activities as much of the surf zone would be inaccessible without ORVs. The NPS, throughout the DEIS, seeks only to restrict ORV usage without proposing ways to improve access for ORVs and providing expanded habitat for those species which are threatened or endangered. It seems the NPS has forgotten the CHNSRA was established as a recreation area. Pea Island National Wildlife Sanctuary is for wildlife, yet under the de facto rules in place from 1978, there has been little difference in the successful breeding of piping plovers or endangered sea turtles. CCA NC urges you to revert to those rules put in place in 1978 to provide maximum access for ORVs and the American citizens.

Correspondence ID: 13138 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Laird, Lance L
Received: May,10,2010 17:39:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I own a 4x4 and an ORV, however, there is a time and a place for everything. This is neither the time nor place.
Thank you
Lance Laird

Correspondence ID: 13139 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Scarborough, Christopher T
Received: May,10,2010 17:39:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a resident of Raleigh, North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area. Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet protection of the Seashore. I have read and agree with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV Plan pending further review and negotiation on the counter points raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.

Correspondence ID: 13140 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Clark, Frank
Received: May,10,2010 17:40:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not feel that any of the 6 proposed alternatives provide a better solution to what we have now. I do agree with the Dare County position.

Correspondence ID: 13141 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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,
Leslie Norman

0012406

Correspondence ID: 13142 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Eades, Debra T
Received: May,10,2010 17:42:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Keep ATV off our sea shores.

Correspondence ID: 13143 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 17:43:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I've been going to the Outer Banks/Cape Hatteras since 1949. The amount of damage done to the entire area by vehicles driving on the beach is shocking and depressing. These vehicles are the cause of erosion and destruction of habitation by the sand crabs, birds, etc that live on the beach. Even worse, Off the road vehicles come loaded up with canned drinks, papers, plastic, junk, etc which all gets dumped on the beach. They will pack it in, but they won't back it out. These people have no respect for nature or anyone but themselves.
If you permit year around ORVs on the beach, you might as well just destroy the beach outright. The beach will be totally devastated. Whatever your plan is, is should respect nature and people who venture out onto the beach on foot. Please do not destroy what little beauty remains of Cape Hatteras.

Correspondence ID: 13144 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Castle, Alan C
Received: May,10,2010 17:47:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear USF, the continued philosophy you exhibit will with out a doubt cause another revolutoion in this country. During WWII the Nazi's seized what wasn't theirs,ask the French and Polish. You are doing the same thing and it will stop one way or another, sincerely Alan C. Castle

Correspondence ID: 13145 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Witte, Jeffrey
Received: May,10,2010 17:48:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The homeowners & business owners care the most for the preservation of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area and can effectively maintain a healthy environment for both public use and natural resources. The "locals" are the best people to listen -- they care more than any outside or distant organization. Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 13146 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 17:50:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep off-road vehicles off Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13147 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 17:50:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
There should be a balance between motorized and pedestrian use, and alternative F in its current form is not a fair balance.

Correspondence ID: 13148 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 17:50:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
Dear Supt. Murray, I write as a long-time visitor to the Outer Banks from Nags Head down to Ocracoke. The places on the national seashore where I spend the most time -- and the communities where I spend my money as a visitor -- are those where I can enjoy nature -- all of it, including birds and sea turtles, and not just fish. I have to believe that the greatest ECONOMIC benefit to Hatteras and Buxton in the long run will be the option -- Alternative D -- that preserves the birds and sea turtles as members of the ecosystem that makes the national seashore at Hatteras so appealing to the ORV drivers heading to their fishing spots. After all, if you suddenly proposed to pave the Hatteras beaches and stripe the asphalt with parking spots for the fishermen, they'd be horrified. They'd say that's not what they're there for. Well, the natural scene they enjoy while surf-casting is one that should include not just gulls but nesting colonial shorebirds and nesting sea turtles. It needs to be a complete and healthy beach ecosystem.
I support the alternative that will allow all to enjoy the Hatteras seashore including pedestrians. And I particularly think it's important to establish recovery goals for the species that have been beaten down and routed out by almost unlimited ORV use on the seashore -- recovery goals that should be based on the potential of the beach to support those species, whether turtles or terns. It is an absolute shame that things have gotten so far out of balance at Hatteras that only one group counts -- off-road vehicle drivers.
I want to be able to recommend the Hatteras seashore to my nature-loving friends, including those who come here from other states -- not tell them that they have to go to Ocracoke if they want to see what the national seashore can be -- or not to go south of Pea Island. Is that what motel and restaurant owners in Hatteras and Buxton want to hear? Of course not! Well, there's an alternative that would make me want to send my friends and myself to the Hatteras/Cape Point shore. Alternative D would make it happen. Respectfully submitted, Virginia Travis 5244 Old Woods Road Hillsborough, NC27278

Correspondence ID: 13149 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 17:50:32
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:	13150	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 17:52:16						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I am writing in regard to your plan for Cape Hatteras. ORVs don't need to drive on the beach, but many species need to live there. With pressure from global warming, environmental toxins, and general habitat loss, I hope you will give the wildlife more consideration than the drivers. I understand that the ORV lobby is rich and powerful, but that doesn't give them the right to make a mess of the beaches. I regularly visit the Outer Banks. I don't go there to drive on the beach, but rather to watch birds. Please act responsibly.						
Correspondence ID:	13151	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Callahan, David E						
Received:	May,10,2010 17:52:34						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Off-road vehicles (except for fisherman) are a menace to any seashore!						
Correspondence ID:	13152	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 17:54:42						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	NPS As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV. Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures. In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative. Sincerely, Bruce Hashinger						
Correspondence ID:	13153	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Hall, Charles A						
Received:	May,10,2010 17:56:54						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Open our beaches and we will take care of them. We and the wildlife will adapt to LIVE together.						
Correspondence ID:	13154	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Harris, Carl A						
Received:	May,10,2010 17:57:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I grew up in N.C. and have been a regular visitor to the Outer Banks for 45 years and a property owner in Buxton for almost 20 years. I believe that prior to the court ruling the Park Service non-plan was a good plan. I believe it was a very reasonable compromise between people and wildlife. The public/orv corridor to "historic" fishing areas had minimal if any impact on wildlife. The existing situation amounts to a taking of livelihood from businesses that have existed for years and rely on tourists that come year round for the best fishing area on the East Coast. In looking over the options on the Park Service management plan it would seem that the least restrictive option is still more restrictive than the present court ordered situation. Please consider returning to the rules that worked for so many years and make that the official plan. The present situation and any of the options in the proposed park service plan will choke the economic life out of the small towns, businesses and individuals, many of who's families have been part of the Outer Banks for generations. Sincerely, Carl A. Harris						
Correspondence ID:	13155	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Simpson, Ted A						
Received:	May,10,2010 17:58:46						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	What a ridiculous waste of time and resources, this document is not only an accumulation of suspicious facts and figures but must represent millions of						

dollars in time preparation. Unfortunately you should take the whole document and throw it in the trash can as all the recommendations are worthless. This area was dedicated to being a recreation area for humans, not birds and turtles. If the original owners had been aware that this land would be used in this manner, no doubt they would have never given it to the park service. You have raped them, present and future users of the park of their God given right to enjoy this area in the natural manner it was supposed to be used. I employ you to wake up and use some common sense, repeal the consent decree and put the park back into it's place as one of the few places left on this earth that can be used by people who have a sincere and dedicated love for the beach. You owe it to all US citizens to correct this unfair and senseless act!

Correspondence ID:	13156	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	huss, phil						
Received:	May,10,2010 18:02:06						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	13157	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 18:02:17						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>You may think it odd that someone in Arizona would care about the North Carolina coast, but it's true. I also live where there's lots of sand, and I can attest to destruction done by ATV's & ORV's. Dunes are extremely fragile, and sand can easily be displaced, to the point that your beach could eventually end up off Miami!! NOW is the time to make sure that doesn't happen.</p> <p>I am a long-time member of the National Parks Conservation Association. As such, I expect our prized landmarks to be maintained for this - and future generations. One would hate to see them simply eroded away due to lack of oversight. Protection is critical.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	13158	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 18:04:59						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	13159	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 18:05:35						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I disagree with the NPS management of resource protection and visitor beach access following the DEIS. Alternative opportunities, stated in the Collation for Beach Access, for these beach closures have been put down in detail. One example in regard to the 5-year review process of the DEIS, on p.124, on specific beach and species management.</p> <p>As stated in the collation, there could be "less restrictive closures." There could be a shortened time frame for these review processes with multiple investigations within each management. Also, investigations within each closure could help determine further beach access opportunities and reports. Thus, more accurate data can be made along with helping the economic status of the North Carolina Coastline.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	13160	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						

Received: May,10,2010 18:05:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I submit this comment in support of Dare County's proposal to urge the National Park Service to make changes in their preferred alternative F to incorporate the provisions outlined in their position statement.
 I too believe it will be beneficial to the long range success for wildlife, enhance the visitor experience and improve the lives of those living near the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.
 Without these changes, people will suffer continued harm to their livelihoods. I am a small business owner in Rodanthe/Hatteras Island; a mobile wedding ministry. The beaches of the Outer Banks continue to rank top in the country, and our area is specifically popular for 'destination beach weddings'. Beach closures have greatly impacted my business; TY 2009 revealed a 25% decrease in income!
 And may I also state it is unfair and inaccurate (and to my offense!) for the National Park Service to simply write off someone like myself and the income I depend on under Alternative F as "negligible to moderate."!
 I thank the NPS for wanting to be good stewards of God's wildlife here on the OBX--yet pray you will have utmost concern for His human lives and livelihoods!

Correspondence ID: 13161 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Smock, Arthur D
Received: May,10,2010 18:07:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Supt. Murray,

My wife and I moved to Hatteras Island over 20 years ago with our young daughters. Both of them have since grown and prospered on the Island contributing as young business people and one is a Teacher at Cape Hatteras Secondary School. We came to the Island like most people do, because of the open beaches and multitude of recreational activities that are associated with those beaches. We built a small business during that time- The Islander Gifts, located on Rte 12 in Frisco, and have had a steady increase in business over the last 16 years until the Consent Decree and downturn in the overall economy.

My family, which has grown to include two local born son-in-laws and two locally born and bred grandchildren, is a solid contributing member of the Hatteras Island community. We disagree with the DEIS economic impact analysis. There seems to be little in the way of hard evidence that the impact analysis was conducted to any extent that it would be helpful in determining how any of the Alternatives impact the average local business owner.

1. On page 566- The DEIS states that a survey was conducted ... of potentially impacted businesses. We have many contacts within the community and attend many functions where other local business owners participate, and we have yet to hear of a single business owner on Hatteras Island that was a survey participant.

2. Page 566 also contains a table that refers to data collected in 2004. Surely, more current information is available from Dare County Officials, and my wife and I would be more than happy to provide real sales data- to the most recent monthly tax filings, that would show an accurate reflection of how the Consent Decree has impacted our business.

My wife, Elizabeth and I, as local business owners, respectfully urge you to consider the 'true' impacts of the DEIS and the alternatives contained therein. Our business, since the Consent Decree, has suffered a 14% decrease over the previous 5 years receipts. To a small business, that is the difference between paying the bills, and making a small profit, to being required to get another job to pay the bills. We can truly tell when Cape Point is closed- there are immediate effects to our daily sales for the days that the Point is closed to ORVs.

Please consider all of the impacts when you make this difficult decision- we can live with limitations to the beach driving, but believe that the scales have tipped in favor of the wildlife. We harbor no ill feelings towards the wildlife, but would appreciate the opportunity to show that we can be good stewards without onerous restrictions that affect all small businesses on Hatteras Island.

Thank you for your consideration,
 Arthur and Elizabeth Smock

Correspondence ID: 13162 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 18:11:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Sir: My family has been coming down to the Outer Banks for 5 years. We own a house in Rodanthe, N.C. and possibly are thinking of retiring there in a few years. The news of the beach closings was very, very alarming to all of us. I can't imagine not being able to go on the beach when we are there. We know that many people that we have spoken to about this, share our feelings also. Many visitors come down to Cape Hatteras throughout the year, and generate enormous revenue for the state. If beaches are closed, this will not only hurt rental seasons, but also affect the revenues of the businesses, employees and residents of the island. In Delaware and other northern beaches, they charge a small fee to pedestrians to use the beaches and to drive on designated beaches, a park pass is available for daily use or season pass. Isn't this an alternative, so traffic can be controlled on the beaches? It will also create revenue for the State, and help to replenish the shoreline, etc. A national seashore should be enjoyed by everyone, not only for wildlife but also by people that support them. To take this away from visitors to the island, is a great national tragedy.

Correspondence ID: 13163 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 18:13:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: BACKGROUND AND INTEREST:

I am an owner of an oceanfront property in Avon NC, part of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I spend 4 plus weeks per year in the house plus numerous weekends, and use the house to generate rental income to partially offset the mortgage and operational costs during the remainder of the year (normally rentals go from April ? November). Most of the times my family and I are there are during the off-season weeks or weekends in the fall, winter and spring, with perhaps one week during the summer tourist peak. I love the area and am very much interested in its conservation and preservation. I have always considered myself to be a strong environmentalist and have contributed to environmental causes and organizations. Professionally, I am a research molecular biologist, and have a Ph.D. in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology from Cornell University. I operate a small biotechnology business in Virginia.

OVERALL IMPRESSIONS:

As a scientist, I think that much of the data many of these proposals are based upon is not statistically significant. The main problem is the small number of bird breeding pairs due to the fact that Cape Hatteras is on the southernmost fringe of the Piping Plover's range. Less than 3% of the Atlantic population of Piping Plovers are in North Carolina (Melvin SM and Hecht A, Waterbirds 32(1):64-72. 2009), consisting of 46 pairs in the entire state (not just Hatteras Island). Hatteras Island seems to rarely have over 10 nesting pairs (p 195). Thus it is very difficult to make any statistically valid conclusions about ORV impact without an extremely long study period, especially with the number of confounding factors (variations in predator populations, weather variations, climate change, etc). Thus year to year comparisons attempting to show impact are very difficult to attribute to a specific cause, and the amount of human (and ORV) impact (if any) demonstrated in the document in Cape Hatteras National Seashore is statistically insignificant. It is clear from the Park Services own historic statistics that most failures to go from nesting to fledging are due to non-human factors, including mammalian predation (including predation from a large population of feral cats on the island), tidal and storm washouts, avian predation and crab predation. Human disturbances account for less than 5% of egg and chick mortality according to the park services own figures, and some of that has been from Park Service monitoring and banding activities.

As a vacationer in Avon, I am not enthusiastic about ORV's on the village beaches; however I cannot see much scientific justification for many of the

restrictions proposed in options B-F. The main problems I've had with ORV's in the off season on the village beaches have been caused by a small number of ORV operators, who see the beach as a chance for joyriding, and travel at excessive speeds, causing risk to children playing on the beach. There is rarely a problem with serious fishermen speeding or otherwise causing problems. I personally find the tire tracks on the beach to be very unaesthetic, and I am also concerned that the ORV traffic near the dunes breaks down dune formation that is essential to protecting my property from over-wash during major storms. Because of this I strongly favor a permit system and would support a longer closure of the village beaches to ORV's. But otherwise, it seems that the NPS had been doing an excellent job of protecting the bird and turtle breeding areas before the Consent Agreement, and therefore I would in general favor Alternative A, with the exception of implementing an ORV permit system for educational purposes. Finally, as a dog owner, and person who rents to many other dog owners, I see no justification for the restrictions on leashed dogs on the village beaches during the bird breeding season, which overlaps part of the peak tourism season. This would cause unnecessary kenneling expenses for the vacationers and would seriously degrade an important portion of the beach experience for many who enjoy walking on the beach with their dogs, without having any impact at all on bird survival.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

ORV's vs Piping Plover populations ? Cause and effect?

Page i of the executive summary includes the following paragraph:

"Historically, beach driving at the Seashore was for the purpose of transportation, and not recreation. The paving of NC-12, the completion of the Bonner Bridge connecting Bodie and Hatteras islands in 1963, and the introduction of the State of North Carolina ferry system to Ocracoke Island facilitated visitor access to the sound and ocean beaches. Improved access, increased population, and the popularity of the sport utility vehicle have resulted in a dramatic increase in vehicle use on Seashore beaches. There has also been a decline in most beach nesting bird populations on the Seashore since the 1990s."

This paragraph appears to imply that the period from 1963 to the present is not part of the "historical" pattern of beach use. This is almost half a century. Thus for the majority of the US population, who are under 47, there has been beach driving for all of their lives, and for those over 47, there has been 'recreational' driving on Hatteras Island for the greater part of their lives and driving in general for all of their lives.

To imply that the increase in SUV popularity in the 90's and the decline of the bird population are "correlated" is an attempt to impart cause and effect where none likely exists. Many other changes occurred on Hatteras Island during that period. There was a large building boom on the island during that time, there has been significant global warming over the past two decades, there has been a very significant decline in fish populations, bay scallops have greatly declined and predatory species such as sharks have declined in ways that affect the overall ecology (Meyers RA, et al, Science 30 March 2007: Vol. 315, pp. 1846 ? 1850). Thus to imply that the decline of the bird population is due to the increase in ORV popularity is unscientific and disingenuous. Nowhere in the report is there any direct data showing significant numbers of deaths, nest destruction, or failure to fledge caused by ORVs over the 1980's or 1990's in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore to support this conclusion. The data summarized on p 210 does not indicate ANY Plover deaths due to ORV's since 2000, just intrusions into enclosures, which is an enforcement problem. Thus this so called inverse "correlation" between ORV popularity and Piping Plover population cannot and should not be used as the basis for developing public policy.

Indeed, as stated in the report itself (p 208): "Small populations such as the Atlantic Coast piping plover populations face a heightened risk of extinction compared to large populations because they are more vulnerable to the following: (1) random environmental variations, such as storms; (2) reduction in genetic variations that limit a species' ability to adapt to local conditions; (3) sudden, random drops in birth and death rates; and (4) an impaired ability to find suitable mates (Lande 1988)."

Thus on the basis of the bird population, it certainly seems that Option A, or Option A with an educational ORV permit, would be adequate for protecting the Piping Plover and other shore bird populations on the island.

PETS:

On page 136, regarding the American Oyster Catcher, Alternative F proposes the prohibition of pets on the beaches in front of the villages.

"Implementation of a permit system with an educational component, larger buffer sizes, seasonal nightdriving restrictions, prohibition of pets in the Seashore during breeding season including in front of the villages, and establishment of breeding and nonbreeding SMAs would benefit the American oystercatcher."

First of all, this goes beyond the scope of an ORV management plan, as it is now talking about managing people and pets in the village areas, not vehicles. The village areas are of major economic importance to Hatteras Island, as these are where almost all of the visitors stay (other than those in the NPS campgrounds). A major part of the historic "beach experience" in this area has been the opportunity to bring pets, especially dogs, as many of the rental houses allow them. The park service has a leash law, and as a dog owner, I can tell you it is well enforced in the village beaches. The following statement is made regarding pets on pp 326, 329, 336, among others:

"The presence of pets at the Seashore, including during breeding season, has the potential to adversely impact piping plover as some visitors to the Seashore do not observe the requirement for pets to be restrained in some manner, as observed by Seashore staff. If there is little or limited compliance with pet restrictions in the areas of closures, a negative effect on the plovers could result (USFWS 1996a)"

This statement shows that it is a lack of enforcement that causes the potential to disturb the birds, not the presence of properly leashed pets. There is no reason to expect that if pet laws are not properly enforced, there would be any difference. Indeed, once someone is put in the position of already "breaking the law" by taking a pet to the beach, keeping it leashed would no longer seem relevant. The quoted statement also provides no evidence that Seashore staff have observed controlled or leashed pets disturbing birds, only that the leash laws are sometimes not observed. And even this does not mean that the pet is not under control of the owner. It is much more likely that any disturbance by unleashed pets will be while the pet is not under control of an owner, such as an irresponsible owner who allows their pet to roam outside while they are inside. There is no reason to punish the responsible pet owner who leashes and controls their pets in the beach areas in front of the villages for the irresponsible action of people who by all rights should not own pets.

It is much more likely that nest and bird disturbances are the result of uncontrolled or feral cats and dogs. There are soft-hearted locals who "adopt" these feral animals (especially cats) and continue to feed them, thus increasing their population. The most effective pet control would be to educate these people and to begin a serious effort to spay and neuter these "adopted" feral animals through free clinics. Prohibiting leashed dogs from the beach will likely have zero effect on bird survival.

CONCLUSION:

In conclusion, I feel options B ? F each contain items that are unnecessarily restrictive. Option A allows the local NPS professional staff adapt to changing conditions and to protect the bird breeding using their professional training and discretion, while still allowing recreational ORV access to most of the shoreline. I would be happy to see permitting of the ORV's as a means of educating the drivers about the need to be careful of nesting areas, and a strict speed limit in the village areas, however this and the other protective measures should be left to the discretion of the local park professionals.

Correspondence ID: 13164 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Fratoe, Vincent
Received: May,10,2010 18:16:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support free and open beaches. I believe restricting beach access will have detrimental effects on our local economy. Visitors come here to enjoy our free and open beaches. If you do restrict anything from our beaches I hope it's the oil that is coming our way. I am against any restriction of access by anything on any of our beaches.

Correspondence ID: 13165 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 18:16:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been fishing the Outer Banks, in particular, the Buxton beaches down to the end of the island since 1980. I first began my quest for Red Drum by walking from ramp #44 to the point. I did this for three or four years before I realised a four wheel drive vehicle would save me a lot of effort walking

across the deep sand with rods, bucket, rod holders, etc. and in waders to boot. I recall the protected areas for the piping plover roped off even back then. However, the protected areas were reasonably structured and everyone I witnessed treated the protected areas with the utmost respect. They were not so intrusive that many acres of access were cut off from ORV's as it appears now as a result of environmental tenticles slithering over miles of recreational beaches.

My most recent trip was April 19.....to 22 of this spring. I was appalled at the amount of beach access denied to the surf fisherman who have enjoyed these beaches for well over a century. I have read the DEIS a couple of times and am still trying to digest all the alternatives of which very few favor the recreational fisherman. Not living on the island I have not been able to see the insidious encroachment of the environmental societies over the past few years. Posts and string with signage all over the place....even the ride to Okracoke is lined for miles with the beach access denial.

I also surf fish at IBSP in New Jersey. It is only 1 hour and 45 minute drive from Doylestown. I can imagine the angst those of us who fish the Jersey Coast would be faced with if the prime fishery, like Cape Point, was closed at the whim of environmentalists and the National Park Service who are doing a disservice to the fishery and it's economy by shutting down inordinate amounts of beach access. Fortunately IBSP is state owned and not under the control of the National Park Service aka Audubon Society. I am very discouraged by the efforts of the environmentalists to hold surf fisherman hostage in such an invasive and all encompassing way.

It would be absolutely refreshing and restore my faith in humanity if all the players involved sit down in a mature fashion and come up with a resolution to this problem that will not only protect the endangered species but do it in a way that is not so controlling and intrusive to the survival of the recreational aspect of the Outer Banks. If not, myself as well as many others will be put in the position of saving the wear and tear on their vehicles and thousands of dollars spent on lodging food, and supplies. It would be quite a loss as I love the Outer Banks.

Sincerely,

Harrison D. Woodruff NCBBA #7975

Correspondence ID: 13166 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 18:20:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13167 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 18:20:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13168 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 18:20:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13169 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 18:20:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13170 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Riley, Patrick W
Received: May,10,2010 18:21:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To: The National Park Service Regarding:2010 03Mar 05 - Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS
The Cape Hatteras National Seashore has provided my family with great benefit and recreational enjoyment over the years. The focus of this enjoyment is the ability to drive on the beach with our four children. They are now aged 12,13,18,20 and we have been visiting for many years. Please do not deprive my children the great family joys of beach driving on the National Seashore. Safely driving on the beach is what sets the Outer Banks apart from all other beach experiences. There are many people from these parts that travel to Cape Hatteras and find a great communion with nature driving out on the beach. Please consider my request to keep the beaches open for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States.
Reasonable access has included Beach Driving since before the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area was established by legislation. Please stop closing our National Recreational area! If you must protect an endangered species please keep driving corridors open around the species.
Non - endangered species should not be used to close the beach.
We must respect the creation we have been entrusted with. Even our laws require you to so. However,I am convinced that these Islands that were stabilized by man can and should continue to be used in the same manner that they always have.
I am convinced that the extreme weather experienced on the Cape has far more impact on the habitat than beach driving.
Most Sincerely, Patrick William Riley Accident,Md.

Correspondence ID: 13171 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hennessy, George
Received: May,10,2010 18:22:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a tourist to the outer banks on several occasions and past renter in village areas I fail to understand why opening an additional few miles of beach to motor vehicles is considered a balanced allocation to all users of a very limited resource. When going to a location such as the Outer Banks I am going for a beach environment to get away from my daily city work environment of Manhattan. I am not going in order to be surrounded by vehicles in a natural environment.
The individuals who seek expanded motor vehicle access already have tens and tens of miles of beach open to them. If I am going to spend thousands of dollars to rent a beach house I would like to know that I can enjoy the beach undisturbed and without fear of bodily harm to myself or my children. To continue limiting vehicle access in just the residential village areas is not an unreasonable limit on vehicle access given the preponderance of ready access that is available to them already. Vehicle access miles will still outweigh the amount of beach that is available for purely pedestrian type access in residential village areas if current restrictions remain in effect. Every major city in the world sees fit to balance the interest of pedestrian and cars. Even NYC saw fit to close off major areas of Time Square to allow pedestrians the opportunity for a richer experience of a national icon. I can walk the sidewalks and pedestrian ways of Manhattan and have a reasonable expectation that I will not be struck by a vehicle. I will not have the same reasonable assurance on the beach in villages that are proposed to be opened.

If open access for vehicles without open access for pedestrians is the result then I and no doubt many others will choose to spend our beach time in other locales where fear of bodily harm will not squelch the benefits of visiting the shore. It is not unreasonable the all three parties (cars, people and birds) be afford a balanced allocation of this scarce national resource.

Correspondence ID: 13172 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, Courtney
Received: May,10,2010 18:24:17
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: 13173 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 18:25:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The off-road vehicle management plan/environmental impact statement is a flawed document, and I ask that you please consider the following:
 The plan is not just restrictive to off road vehicle use, but limits much pedestrian access as well, and can be considered as discriminatory to individuals with disabilities. Even the areas designated as open to ORVs and pedestrians are subject to closures of up to 1,000 meters in all directions, which is quite excessive, and will ultimately close a beach once designated as "open" for a lengthy periods which can be crucial in the midst of tourist season. For example, ramp 23, the only public beach access in all of the tri-village area, is currently closed. Its "temporary" nesting closure lasted the entire summer season last year, resulting in huge financial losses to retailers in the tri-villages; two are currently out of business in the Pamlico Station, a direct result of profit decline following the beach closure period. While there appears to be documentation that minimizes the impact of closures on Hatteras Island due to statistics involving visitors to northern beaches and the Wright Brothers Memorial, I'm certain other areas of the island have experienced similar circumstances and overall loss of revenue. The National Park Service should have a responsibility to the people of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands as well as a commitment to the wildlife. It is inconsiderate to enforce beach closures at peak season weeks such as July 4th, Memorial Day, and Labor Day. Instead, enforce the protection of birds and turtles by holding individuals accountable for their actions while visiting our beaches rather than sacrificing the livelihoods of families that depend economically on beach accessibility. Furthermore, the proposed closures and restrictions may not even be in the best interests of the species in need of protection. For example, nest relocation should be considered. Why is this done when there is a threat of severe weather, yet the threat of economic destruction is not viewed as significant enough to move these nests to Pea Island? There are islands in the sound and other areas available which contain proper vegetation, improved habitat, with less likelihood of interference. Beach closures should be limited to a more reasonable 10 meters surrounding nesting areas. Prohibition of night driving also encourages the presence of predators who may have been previously deterred by vehicles, especially ghost crabs, a significant threat to turtle eggs. Rather than closing off entire sections of beach under the assumption that it will improve wildlife protection is irresponsible. Let's take a more aggressive approach that will benefit both the environment and the people who enjoy it. Other states are able to balance access by using the "average high tide lines" to determine which nests are at risk and to relocate as needed. For the most part, I believe our visitors and locals alike are law-abiding, and have demonstrated respect and restraint in regards to closure areas. In fact, the vast majority of threats to birds and turtles have been weather and predator related, with human interference having the absolute least impact. The National Park Service has not made public a record of incidents which indicate a significant conflict between ORV use and wildlife destruction, and no piping plover deaths have been attributed to ORV use that I know of. Therefore, please consider a more reasonable compromise, as the current proposals undermine our freedoms and cultural heritage. Upon its arrival on Cape Hatteras in the 1930s, the National Park Service committed itself verbally to the natives and in writing to the preservation of their cultural traditions. I would say that since roads didn't exist on Hatteras Island at the time, ORV use is part of the heritage, along with the recreational traditions such as surfing, fishing, sun-bathing, bonfires, picnics, swimming, kite boarding, etc. that continue to attract locals and tourists to our area. Please consider a less restrictive plan that will not only preserve wildlife, but preserve the lives of the families and their heritage on our National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13174 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Scott, Gerone
Received: May,10,2010 18:27:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.
 Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.
 Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.
 The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success.

More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13175 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gibbs, Marsha
Received: May,10,2010 18:28:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

I think what is going on with the beaches is ridiculous. There is so much involved if the beaches close just because of the "birds"..Don't the people who live there have a right?.They are human. Without the beaches open there are people who's jobs are at risk. The economy is bad enough. People need their jobs..People come to the outer banks because of the beaches. People travel from all parts of the world to come HERE. Without the beaches you will have NO PEOPLE!.What part of this problem don't you understand!.The fisherman have a right to go fishing and families have the right to take their kids to the beaches to enjoy the sand and ocean. We are tax payers and I thought we have rights. But I guess the birds have more rights that HUMANS. I guess the birds can help pay people's wages. Years ago we didn't have this problem. People came and they had fun. The birds go to BIRD ISLAND. That island is still there with OH! yeah, BIRDS. Stop and count your blessing. The good LORD gave us these waters to enjoy. Don't try to take away something that isn't yours.

Correspondence ID: 13176 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Raich, Cathy
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Date: May 10, 2010
To: National Park Service
From: C. Raich
Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments
My comments concern the DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs.] Piping Plover deaths have not been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems that any transgressions into protected area could be significantly reduced if NPS manpower was added, increasing enforcement, rather than supposing that the public purposefully or willingly violates violating out of bounds areas.
2) Page 1: I agree with your statement ORVs have traditionally served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors.However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc) 3) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This makes the disabled person have a driver for drop off and pick up, repairing to a parking lot and back. Meanwhile, the disabled person must manage a long distance, through often hot and deep sand, to access the beach and return same,to get back to the vehicle. Should the handicapped person want to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him. does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.
4) Page 121-127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CANT get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two bufferedends. Please consider ORV pass-thru only corridors and use breeding/nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.Pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.
The 1000 meter distance for piping plover seems excessive and not founded on other scientific findings or successful operations in other areas hosting similar birds. Other precedent supports a 200 meter buffer.
Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds need to be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.
NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.
5) Page 124: I disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.
6) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian/ORV Closure Policies. Nest failures are predominantly due to non-human events, according to your stats: mammalian predation is 54%; Storm/Lunar Tides: 29%; Nest Abandonment: 6%; Avian Predation: 5%; and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%. Percentage due to human interference is JUST 3% -- an insignificant amount. However, the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles. This indicates a desire to apply power and control without cause, while denying public access. There is room for protection and public use of these beautiful coastal areas, and is historically the intent when the Cape Hatteras National Seashore was founded.
7) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are resourceful. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.
8) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement protect and preserve natural and cultural resources appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.
Year round residents of Hatteras Island communities have traditions, and many returnees their own, have used south beach for gatherings, beach and surf activities. These are things passed through generations, and enjoyed by multiple generations, together. It allows for historical identity to perpetuate and for visitors to continue their own traditions while sharing this island.
9) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages. Many visitors pass through Hatteras Island from the northern villages, most do not engage in activities on these beaches. Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.
Based upon the economic harm the village businesses have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of

Alternative F to be substantial.

According to local business owners, beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to adapt to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

10) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Would a group of surf fishermen want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

10) Pages 125; 392; 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

11) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access actually means denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. This is far excessive and offers no attempt to balance public use with resource management -- again, violating the spirit of the original creation and establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

12) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. Please consider a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

13) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those who want to access the beaches in these areas. This appears such an arbitrary act if not overturned.

Conclusion: Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, 1938 said, "When we look up and down the ocean fronts of America, we find that everywhere they are passing behind the fences of private ownership. The people can no longer get to the ocean. When we have reached the point that a nation of 125 million people cannot set foot upon the thousands of miles of beaches that border the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, except by permission of those who monopolize the ocean front, then I say it is the prerogative and the duty of the Federal and State Governments to step in and acquire, not a swimming beach here and there, but solid blocks of ocean front hundreds of miles in length. Call this ocean front a national park, or a national seashore, or a state park or anything you please? I say that the people have a right to a fair share of it." Quote from: Creating and Establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore: The Great Depression through Mission 66 August 2007, Cameron Binkley, SE Regional Office, Cultural Resource Division, National Park Service

Please, let's not create a situation where "The people can no longer get to the ocean." Let us not swing so far from the original intent of beach access and preservation, where we allow the loss of one over the other. There is room for both -- public access and resource promotion.

So we all need to make sure that the DEIS proposal is not really about issues of power and control gained by a committed group with vast resources, over historic community residents and visitors who believe and work towards human beach access and resource promotion/protection. Be successful in your quest for due diligence, and, due not fail us all.

Protect, not Prohibit.

Respectfully, Cathy Raich

Correspondence ID: 13177 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May, 10, 2010 18:31:10
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.

Sincerely,
M. Julie Straub

Correspondence ID:	13178	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 18:31:55						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>As a new property owner on Hatteras Island and a long-time visitor, I am appalled by the bureaucratic and political mess that this relatively simple issue has become. The beaches of Hatteras Island belong to the public. There is no evidence whatsoever that any bird or animal is threatened by public foot and ORV access. The fact that environmental groups have been able to buy their way into this access issue proves that they have no concern about the traditions and culture of the Outer Banks. Surf fishing, beach combing, relaxing, swimming, surfing, etc. have been practiced on the Outer Banks for decades. The entire economy of the villages on Hatteras Island is based on the tourists that these activities draw throughout the year. The piping plovers, American Oystercatchers and other shorebirds have thrived on the Banks along with the tourism and economy of the island until a few years ago. I believe that limiting access by foot and ORV only serves the interests of a relatively few radical environmentalists to the detriment of hundreds of businesses and thousands of tax-paying, law-abiding citizens who only want to enjoy the beach with their families and friends. If there is such a big threat to the birds, why doesn't the NPS add some staff on the island and stop spending its precious discretionary resources on responding to frivolous lawsuits for birds that are alot less endangered than the precious way of life of an entire island.</p> <p>I appreciate the opportunity to comment and hope that the Federal Government will take a close look at the real issue facing the island - the deteriorated state of the Bonner Bridge over Oregon Inlet.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	13179	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 18:36:02						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>We have been visiting the outerbanks since the 60's. In that time we have always enjoyed the beaches. In the past we would camp at Cape Point campground. One of our most anticipated activities was to go to the point to fish. It was always a major part of our trip going there almost everyday. Now the point is often closed to not only vehicle traffic but also to pedestrian traffic as well. If the national seashore is there for the enjoyment of the people, then it should be accessible for all. I feel it is criminal that one group can dictate what is to be for everyone else. I believe that we should protect wildlife but, I feel that some compromise should and can be made here. There is after all a wildlife refuge not to far to the North of Rodanthe that is designated for wildlife protection. I can understand the closing of the beach in this area, that is what it is for. I do not understand that in the areas where they think birds are nesting, why such a large area needs to be closed. It seems that the recreational user is punished for no reason. I do believe that if the ORV and recreational users can access the area they too will protect the wildlife as well. Some where along the way it has been decided that if you are an ORV or recreational user that you do not like wildlife. I think this is the furthest from the truth. We are outdoor people instead of eliminating us from participating, let us continue to use the areas and we will make sure that no one is doing any harm as well.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	13180	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Smith, Brenda						
Received:	May,10,2010 18:36:46						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I disagree with the proposed plan. There several businesses that will be adversely affected by the beach closures. I have a rental house in Waves and could very well not have a full season of rents if the beach closure plan goes through. It seems a "median" could be reached if more input could be given by the business owners and by environmentalists. Why not help the unemployment rate and hire more Park Rangers to better police the nesting sites to make sure no one violates the boundaries? Please reconsider before it's too late and an economic nightmare happens! Sincerely, Brenda Smith</p>						
Correspondence ID:	13181	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	McAteer, Marc e						
Received:	May,10,2010 18:39:04						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>My family and I have enjoyed many vacations to Hatteras and hearing that it could be closed to motorized vehicles has saddened all of us. Please keep the beaches open!!!</p>						
Correspondence ID:	13182	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 18:39:09						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I disagree with your claim that you have met your legal obligation to give due consideration to the cultural aspect of the proposed plans. People have been driving on the beaches for centuries. Before motor vehicles there were horses and wagons. The tradition of vehicular activity on the beach is deeply ingrained in the local culture. Yet, in 800+ pages you devote one paragraph.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	13183	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 18:39:18						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Use by man and creature should be protected to the exclusion of neither. Rational minds must prevail.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	13184	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Gould, Burnham & Vivian						
Received:	May,10,2010 18:40:10						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Driving on fragile beaches produces terrible environmental and aesthetic damage. Most species of birds and turtles cannot adopt to environmental changes as readily as humans. We must protect them. Restore the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches to the relatively pristine, wildlife friendly, inspiring beaches that existed before the Park Service took over their management. Now is the time to finally prohibit beach driving. Help protect our wildlife for future generations of all species. Keep motor vehicles off the beaches.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	13185	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 18:44:59						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						

Correspondence: I disagree strongly with many of the proposals in the DEIS and I see a large disconnect with it and the enacting legislation of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. What has happened!? This park was formed for the recreational use of the citizens and visitors of our country and now that legislated use is at risk by the proposals of this DEIS. I acknowledge the enabling legislation also includes the mandate to protect the wildlife of the park and I have always been a proponent of doing so but, it seems so incongruous to restrict access, to so many areas that are traditionally heavily used and true geographic wonders to behold, in pursuit of dubious wildlife protection measures. The keep away distances of nests is extreme ? 1000 meters seems absurd to me. With Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge to the North and the virtual wildlife refuge of the Core Banks National Park islands of Portsmouth, Core Banks and Shackleford Island to the southwest and the Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge to the Northwest and the Swan Quarter National Wildlife Refuge and Lake Mattamuskeet National Wildlife Refuge to the west, it is hard to justify these closures for wildlife that your own statistics state are impacted insignificantly by human interference. Likewise I object to the year round closing of the 2 spits of Hatteras Inlet and other areas - that would be contrary to the intended recreational use of the Park and go against the promise of the NPS superintendent during the establishment of the park, Conrad Wirth, when he addressed the local concern of the access by saying " you will always have ocean and sound side access". I also disagree with the documents assessment of the minimal effects on our local economy it will pose. Since the parks' inception the local economy has changed from one of commercial fishing, very small businesses and subsistence living (gardening, livestock and fishing) to one that is almost entirely dependent on tourism. Conrad Wirth encouraged the local population to accommodate the expected visitors and now it is dependent on them. People like to visit CHNSRA ? many like it a lot. It is an uplifting experience for so many who, by and large, are urban dwellers and benefit from seeing wildlife and unique geography ? it helps them to de-stress, to "chill out". It is valuable to them and our society. The inlets, spits and points are a big part of this. I DO AGREE with the proposed 15 mph speed limit. It is plenty fast. We are fortunate that most of the ORV users in the park are not looking to use their ORV for anything more than access to areas that would be difficult to get to by foot especially with the numerous items they carry for sport (fishing, kayaking, surfing, bogie boarding, wind surfing, kite boarding, volley ball, etc.) and relaxing (chairs, umbrellas, coolers etc.). They drive to a suitable location and park ? some relax while others go at some harmless sport with passion. All leave refreshed and most leave with a reinforced respect for Mother Nature and appreciation for the access our National Park provides. These are good, wholesome, often family based activities that are very beneficial to the users ? especially mentally and spiritually. I have been visiting this park for more than 45 years and only rarely seen any behavior that was detrimental to the Park or its' wildlife. It is not something that is on the agenda of most visitors. I believe the rare cases of improper behavior can be addressed through good law enforcement rather than restricting the entire population. I know some ORV restrictions are necessary and I welcome them. In areas that are near to the road, pedestrian only access should be promoted. Four more ocean side parking areas and four more sound side parking areas would be a big help toward achieving this. Many people in this modern world are overweight partially due to lack of physical activities. Almost anyone can walk. For those who, unfortunately, can't or are otherwise limited, a few more wheel chair accessible walkovers like the "bath house" in Frisco would be helpful. At the spits and points, ORV access would give them the opportunity to experience more of the Recreational Area and these are truly the geographical gems of the Park. I know there is a good chance you will receive many comments in favor of this proposed DEIS and I would be willing to bet most of them will come from people who have never visited the park. It is easy for conservation organizations to paint ORV users as a bunch of dune buggy cowboys speeding around tearing up the terrain and terrorizing wild life in an effort to incite their supporters (one of whom I used to be but??. I was never "incite-able") and get them to flood you with letters in favor of "saving the birds at all costs". The traditional ORV use in the CHNSRA has never been about destruction, it has been about recreation. Please give weighted consideration to the comments of the visitors of the park, they know a lot more about it, they are stake holders and they are for whom the Cape Hatteras National Seashore RECREATIONAL Area was created.

Correspondence ID: 13186 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Scott, Jennifer M
Received: May,10,2010 18:47:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I disagree with the access reducing features of the DEIS and I fear they will have a devastating effect on my life, family and the economy of Hatteras Island. My father and other family members lost property to the establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area but, were told they would benefit more than they would lose. Conrad Wirth encouraged local residents to start visitor based businesses and promised them "you will always have ocean and sound side access". We believed it for quite some time. If this proposal goes into effect our businesses will suffer and our access, as well as the access of the visitors we depend on, will be greatly diminished. Like many locals, I struggled to establish a business through storms, tides and falling bridges and managed to send my children to college and see them prosper off the Island. Since they have recently had children of their own they are excited about returning home to raise them on the Island of their forefathers. This DEIS makes that look difficult and it breaks my heart. I walk through the Park to the beach almost daily. For many years my husband worked with Park interpreters to do a commercial beach fishing demonstration for the visitors. My family and friends have had countless Sunday picnics on the south beach of the Park where our children enjoyed themselves surrounded by nature. My husband surfs, kite boards and fishes, in the Park. He has fought wild fires side by side with NPS personnel both in the Park and on private lands. We often take visitors out to Cape Point and they are always impressed with the uniqueness of it. We share a long property border with the Park. We are intertwined with the Park and we never harm a thing. We like to walk in the park but always keep a functioning ORV to access Cape Point and the other more remote areas. I find it hard to believe our activities are detrimental to birds or turtles. Your own studies state human interference has an insignificant impact on nesting survival. For the rare cases of human activities that are detrimental to wildlife, the enforcement of the law should be employed to address the issue. I know these proposed access reductions will hurt our already suffering economy. The change my family has experienced, from subsistence living and taking a bath once a week, to electricity, year round fresh produce, medical care and a bridge has been a much appreciated improvement. It is our economy that supports these improvements and it is already suffering like much of the country. It cannot be truly viable without the visitors who come for the multiple recreation opportunities the Park provides. The Park belongs to the citizens of this country and it is your job to manage it on their behalf, not on the behalf of a small but well financed and connected group of extremists. Thank you for reading this letter and the consideration I hope you will give to the points made.
Jennifer Midgette Scott Buxton, NC

Correspondence ID: 13187 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Parker, Pattie A
Received: May,10,2010 18:47:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support the coalition's position statement.

Correspondence ID: 13188 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 18:50:27
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: 13189 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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 your time and consideration of this vitally important matter. As a citizen of the Florida Gulf Coast I feel compelled to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras national Seashore. For many reasons, I support Alternative D. "environmentally preferred," (if it is modified to grant greater pedestrian access).
On the Florida Gulf Coast we see all too much disruption of wildlife habitats. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. My colleagues and I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras as actions there could, ultimately, affect all coastal regions. I look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.
Most Sincerely,
Pamela K. Kaiser, Ph D 9543 Woodville Hwy Tallahassee, FL 32305

Correspondence ID: 13190 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 18:50:27
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.
It is important to manage the Seashore for all Americans, not just for the minority of visitors with ORVs, whose way of life is to despoil the environment.
The first priority should be to protect the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13191 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 18:50:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. I am not sure why you even allow off road vehicles in an area whose #1 purpose is to protect wildlife from us!
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13192 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 18:50:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13193 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 18:51:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have lived on Hatteras Island since 1966 and have experienced many positive and wonderful things while living here. What concerns me greatly with this document and the way it has been presented to the public as an ORV issue against the birds. What I read is the gradual elimination of people from the Cape Hatteras Seashore Recreational Area which is my home and the home to all my children and grandchildren.
The ability for the disabled to get the beach here, especially Cape Point, is an incredible opportunity for them. To experience the meeting of the Labrador Current and the Gulf Stream at the Point is breathtaking. To watch nature, to fish, to watch families enjoy nature is beyond words. A trip to the point in a vehicle driving near the ocean's edge is a way to for them to forget their disability.
I looked up the NPS future plans in the DEIS and was not satisfied at all with what I read. On Page 14, I read that only with a special use permit for areas in front of the villages would ORVs be allowed to take disabled visitors to the beach. But, they can't keep the vehicle on the beach? Does that mean that they can't drive themselves to the beach? I am worried through vague and hard to understand language in this document that vehicles won't be allowed to the Point and Hatteras Inlet at all. How can the National Park Service deprive people of this area? It is similar to not allowing people into the Grand Canyon.
I also find the concept of loaning out beach wheelchairs on a first-come, first-serve basis is totally silly. Who is going to push them? Once again, the independence of the disabled in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is just not addressed.
What is so wrong with driving along the beach which is something that has been done on Hatteras since the first vehicle came here? What about our culture here?? The birds do not nest next to the ocean unless their habitat has been disturbed and everyone who has lived here for anytime has watched the Park Service change the habitat at Cape Point. By not taking down the string barriers year after year, what used to be the muddy flats behind the dunes where the birds used to nest, is now a perfect area for raccoons, foxes, deer, etc. Now, birds are forced to nest on the wrong side of the dunes where the ocean is almost guaranteed to ruin them in a strong blow, storm and lunar tide.
I strongly disagree with the way the DEIS deals with the handicapped and with the DEIS lack of common sense.

Correspondence ID: 13194 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 18:52:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the fact that even with resource closures in place, protective species are still at risk when no piping plovers deaths can be attributed to ORVs
I disagree that visitor experience will be negatively impacted by conflicts between pedestrian and ORV users. Why is this when only one minor incident has ever been recorded?
I disagree that Ocracoke, Hatteras and Frisco should have longer ORV closures than other villages even though even though other villages have statistically similar visitor statistics.
Regarding negative impact on ROI, I completely disagree with the fact that you are you making judgments based on 2008 vs. the full year of 2009 to fully assess the future economic and socioeconomic impact on this cultural and historic area.

Correspondence ID: 13195 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Phillips, Chip
Received: May,10,2010 18:52:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I DISAGREE with the fact that even though Pea Island NWR is ABUNDANT ORV free beaches, that we need MORE ORV free areas. How can one be mutually exclusive, and then expect the other to exclude as well.
I DISAGREE with the idea that NPS should be charged with protecting species that are not threatened, nor are they protected elsewhere, as there is no need. I AGREE that the Defenders of Wildlife have added this as a bargaining tool to offer up without giving up anything.
I DISAGREE that Human Intervention is significant enough of a factor to warrant the beach closures.
I DISAGREE with the NPS not considering all locations neighboring the Recreational Area as part of the same ecosystem. Why would spoil islands and beaches in the villages not be considered the same as the parts of the beach that ORV users enjoy?
I DISAGREE that the 30 seconds of the headlights of my truck driving past at night will confuse that same turtle that swam half the length of the eastern

seaboard to come back to the same beach. What about when the moon is setting in the west, why does that not confuse the turtles?

I DISAGREE with the fact that NPS will not adopt turtle management techniques already used in other east coast locations. Why would ours need to be more restrictive?

I DISAGREE with "selective" species eradication. Is the NPS not playing "God" by deciding which species are allowed to be on our beaches and which are not? If a species is native to that ecosystem, how can we choose which ones we want to stay and which to kill?

I DISAGREE with the notion that is a good idea to replace wetlands in this coastal ecosystem setting to provide a parking lot, when all that need be done is allow access to park on the beach.

I DISAGREE with the failure to recognize the de facto plan in place in years leading up to the interim plan.

I DISAGREE with the notion that the only answer to the beach driving issue has to be so broad stroked. Why does something my forefathers have done for generations suddenly become a crime for me or the generations that come after me? I AGREE with wildlife management and responsible use of natural resources. I DISAGREE that man and plover can not get along. NPS MUST find a realistic solution to allow me and my children free and open access to fish on the beach, as has happened for generations.

Correspondence ID: 13196 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 18:53:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As someone who spends a lot of time and money on Hatteras Island I reviewed this document with great interest. Here are my comments:

1. I disagree with the extent of the buffers discussed on pages 121-127. 1000 meters is excessive. There is nothing that indicates that 1000 meters is more protective than 200 meters. I advocate for the alternative 200 meters with daily observation.

2. Having closures and buffers for birds that are not on the endangered list is also excessive. Standard roping off of the nest should be sufficient.

3. I disagree with the stand on no dogs on page 136. The current leash rule on the beach, if strictly enforced, would accomplish the same thing as banning all dogs.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review and comment on this document

Correspondence ID: 13197 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 18:54:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree that there needs to be a predictable and fair plan for accessing our beaches. There are several items that need to be addressed that will help provide a balanced and reasonable plan to protect and provide access to our national seashore shores.

1) Large, inflexible buffers (p.121-127). These buffers that are being considered in the DEIS of 1,000 meter buffer in all directions for the piping plover is to large to allow a balance of human use of the seashore as stated in the original "Park Enabling Legislation". The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such large closures and these extremely large buffers are not used in other federal and state areas for the piping plover! A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters

2) Non-endangered species, such as American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Water birds are given Pre-Nesting closures and buffers up to 300 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300 meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters

3) Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open area that would otherwise be blocked. In alternative F Corridors are only allowed in ML-2 portions of SMA's and are subject to resource closures at any time. In a more reasonable approach Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMA's. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources

4) Turtle Management (Pg.125, 392-396) DEIS claims North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission turtle guidelines will be followed. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas and this would allow better access to beach areas for visitors enjoyment and night driving and fishing.

5) Prohibition of Pets (p136) in the seashore during bird breeding season, including in front of the villages. No pets in public areas, beaches, campgrounds, sound-front, foot trails, park maintained roads from March 15 -July 31 The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science supporting that such a ban on pets would have any positive impact on the breeding birds over the current rules of pets on 6ft leash.

6) Year Round Closures: Hatteras Inlet, North End Ocracoke Island, Ramp 27-Ramp 30 (Salvo) are set to be closed year round to ORV, I am most familiar with the Hatteras inlet area and this area does not have the characteristics of prime habitat for the plover and the other supposed reason for the closure was the need for a pedestrian only area. It would not be economically or environmentally feasible to pave "pole road" and create parking lots in a beautiful and natural setting at the Hatteras Inlet. The need for pedestrian only areas is addressed in adjacent 15 miles of beach on Pea Island, which never gets included in the amount of beach for pedestrian only and is also a wildlife refuge.

7) Economical Impact: the negative economical impact of the "consent decree" has been profound and well documented. Any projected financial losses from these changes will only affect the businesses that are on Hatteras and Ocracoke islands and the impact studies should reflect that and not be spread across the region to lessen the negative financial impact on the villages.

Tom Carr Concerned Visitor/Avid Fisherman 1909 Beechwood Drive Wilmington, DE 19810

Correspondence ID: 13198 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Gregson, Kevin M

Received: May,10,2010 18:54:15

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: A couple weeks ago I watched on the news as people stood at a hearing on beach driving in a coastal town. Most of those present were in favor of lifting restrictions on beach driving. Some of the reasons that they gave were quite simply, pretty lame. I listened as one gentleman said that this was a right given to us by our forefathers. Forefathers? Is that what Thomas Jefferson meant by "pursuit of happiness"? Not being able to drive on the beach does no more to hurt their economy than banning smoking in restaurants. I have noticed since the ban was put in place to ban all smoking in restaurants, many restaurants that use to only have a few customers, are now packed much more than they were prior to the smoking ban. Yet, they fought it tooth and nail. Their war-cry: "It'll hurt our business!" But it didn't. Protecting the environment and doing the right thing does not need statistics to support it or prop it up. The right thing never does. To many it may not make sense right now. To many it may not make sense in the short run. But when righteous decisions are made, they always reward. Maybe not in the ways people expect, but always in ways they realize are much more rewarding. All the tourism will vanish if the environment vanishes. It's not rocket science.

Sincerely, Kevin Gregson

Correspondence ID: 13199 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Hester, Robert S

Received: May,10,2010 18:54:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Hello from Common Sense Pennsylvania.

I have been a 36 year visitor to the Outer Banks and have explored and enjoyed every mile from Corolla to Hatteras Landing. I have great respect for the locals for their tireless efforts to treat tourists like myself as family. Last fall, we spent a month with the Moore's in South Nags Head in two of their

ocean front cottages and have done so for the past 3 years. Some other years we made 3 or 4 individual week long trips throughout the year. From this experience, I have seen the local economy change first handed. Since I own a small customer service oriented business, I am keenly aware of how the public perception of a location directly affects that locations economy. It is obvious from my last visit that Hatteras Island is in financial peril and it seems perverse that such a war of legal eagles is unsympathetic to this fact. With such high unemployment in this country, competition for the few luxury travel dollars is fierce. It is very understandable why the local population is so mad at the ridiculous access restrictions put on by the injunction. Closing mile after mile of prime tourist beach during the peak season has hurt the economy as a whole and threatens people's homesteads and way of life. These people are fighting for their lives and I fully agree with them. If you need proof of this, the Frisco pier is a clear example. Damaged a few years back, the owners obviously don't want to invest money that they have very little chance to make a return on. This is a direct effect of the beach access injunction. How? Years back we used to stay in the area from Rodanthe to Buxton, now with so many local businesses closed in the area, we stay in South Nags Head. Our move north is the direct impact of the beach closures. There is no reason for us to cross the Bonner Bridge if the beach is closed. Now, multiply my exact reaction by tens of thousands and you can obviously see the impact on the Hatteras Island economy. Now, the common sense part. We have an obligation to future generations to protect any endangered species. How this is to be done needs some clear scientific merit. Since the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is only a part of the breeding grounds for the Piping Plover, where endangered species and local economies collide, there should be a minimalist starting approach to area management. Since this area is not the only breeding ground, danger of extinction is reduced if a specific management plan fails to protect the subject species. As many people have said, flexibility is the key to any successful plan that deals with a freely moving life form. Closure of hundreds of acres for each Piping Plover nest site and miles of beach for non threatened species just does not make economic sense. The 1000M proposal for fledgling bird nests seems quite excessive. Being a PA hunter, I know that 700+ acres is quite an area to restrict access to. It requires excessive cost to post and to patrol effectively with no guarantee that natural predation will not occur. Additional money spent to trap possums, raccoons, fox, and stray cats will need to occur and most likely has. Removing these animals from the natural environment can increase the rodent population and upset the natural predator - prey balance. The point of this is that there are consequences for every excessive knee jerk action. By not minimizing the closure area, the tourists don't come. When the tourists don't come, the local economy dies. Traditional ways of life and the cultures they support are forever lost. While this is a difficult problem legally, it just seems to me that all common sense has been ignored for the people who are the guardians of the islands. I hope that some common ground can be reached to protect the Piping Plovers and also the islands traditional way of life.

PS ? I am not implying that Pennsylvania is full of common sense but only offer one educated mans opinion on the impact to local economies when people make unrealistic rules that adversely impact others.

Correspondence ID:	13200	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 18:54:27						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	NO !!! NO !!! NO !!!! IT IS UNHEALTHY TO WILDLIF AND HUMANS ALIKE THAT THEY EVEN ALLOW VEHICLES ON THE BEACH WHERE I AM HERE ON THE COAST FROM OCTOBER TO MAY BUT ALL YEAR WOULD DEFINITELY BE A DISASTER !!! WE HAVE WHEEL CHAIRS WITH BIG WHEELS TO GET THE DIASABLED OUTSIDE AND AT THE SURF !!!! PLEASE KEEP OUR BEACHES FOR SAFE WALKING SINCERELY , francine						
Correspondence ID:	13201	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Phillips, Chip						
Received:	May,10,2010 18:55:44						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I DISAGREE with the notion the the issue of beach driving is a foregone conclusion and that the public comment period is merely a formality only. I AGREE that the public has a voice which MUST be considered. I AGREE that NPS must find a moderate resolution to this issue promptly.						
Correspondence ID:	13202	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,10,2010 18:56:08						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please do not permit ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. ORV's cause erosion and tear up landscapes. The water quality will be quickly degraded, and there will be increased pollution affecting air as well as water. ORV's do not fit in with National Seashore designation, please keep them out.						
Correspondence ID:	13203	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 19:01:36						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	All the appropriate comments have been made by Outer Banks residents before my comment tonight on Monday, May 10, 2010 so I do not need to repeat what other residents have said before me. The important point is that the residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands and the northern Outer Banks are all protective of our fragile coastline. We are NOT "off the road" negligent beach drivers. Pedestrians along with handicapped individuals need to be able to access the National Seashore. Please use the results of REAL scientific studies from other states in setting the standards for NC. This issue is nothing more than political gain for a few with little or no understanding of how we live in harmony with our environment. It IS Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore. Why is "Recreational" now removed? Remove the politics and look at the data WITHOUT hidden agendas! It is important to our county, state and country. We are a special place and many will never enjoy it if the special interests groups have their way!						
Correspondence ID:	13204	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	LANGER, Lillie M						
Received:	May,10,2010 19:04:02						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	The impact of shutting the beaches down will be devastating to the economy in the outerbanks. Worrying about the species of birds disappearing when the human aspect will die out here too. When did we begin feeling that human life is less than that of our feathered friends who have other areas to survive in the region? Our family has been enjoying this human recreational area provided by those who wanted it to be for human recreation. What if they decided to take it all back? Where would the parks and recreation go to earn their living? If this is now all private property hunting birds could become fair game. I am not an advocate of this solution either but I don't see any harm in how we have been able to work and live in conjunction with the birds, turtles, sea and air to the enjoyment for all. Lets not let our blindness and unrealistic expectations push our families out of the right to live where they have for many centuries. It has only been in recent years that this has become an issue for some.						
Correspondence ID:	13205	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,10,2010 19:04:41						

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

I agree with both the Coalition for Beach Access and Dare County assessment of the DEIS.

In addition, I would like to express my opinion on the following specific aspects:

I disagree with the extent of the resource closures (p. 121-127). I feel that they are too extensive. 1,000 meters in all directions is extreme. Please modify these buffers to more reasonable distances and set them based on peer reviewed science.

I disagree with the additional restrictions on pets (p. xxix, p.136). Please do not restrict pets any further than they are already restricted (6' leash on the beach). Pets (dogs in particular) are an important part of the lives of residents and visitors. Restricting pets will have tremendously damaging consequences to the local economy.

Reliable year round access to Cape Point is extremely important. Provide corridors past closure areas but do not restrict Cape Point at any time during the year.

I disagree with choosing to protect certain species over others via predator management (p. 120). Fox, raccoon and other "predators" are wildlife too and should not be trapped and killed to save other "favored" wildlife.

Each of the action alternatives will clearly involve incremental tax payer costs to implement and manage. The environmental groups that demand this additional management should be required to fund it. I would like to see them employ their own resources to monitor the nests around the clock if they so desire.

Please re-consider the cultural and historic implications that these closures disregard. The National Seashore was founded as a recreation area. In order for it to remain a recreation area people need to have access to it.

Correspondence ID: 13206 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 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,

David T. Tayloe, Jr., MD, FAAP

***** 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: 13207 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 19:11:16

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.

Sincerely,

Christian Camphire

Correspondence ID: 13208 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

May 10,2010 National Park Service (NPS) DEIS off-road Vehicle Management Plan Comments

Hello, my name is Ron. We have owned a vacation home for about 15 years in Avon, NC. We first came down with our kids and are now coming down

with them and our grand kids. Hatteras is a perfect vacation spot. Not too crowded, affordable, fishing for the entire family and the ocean is accessible by 4 wheel drive. The NPS appears to want all of that to change and completely drive out the real estate market. If this goes through as proposed, I might as well give my keys to the bank and tell them to shut off the lights when they leave.

I would like to specifically address my concerns to many of the issues raised in the proposal.

1. Page 201. I disagree the statement that with closures, protected species are still at risk. With closures, the risk is that tourism will dry up. People come to NC to enjoy the beaches. People that I know that drive on the beach avoid all nesting areas. I can not say the same for pedestrians walking through nesting areas.
2. Page six and 23. I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocrakoke to ORV access longer than the traditional may 15 to September 15 period for the northern beaches even though this would make our house more desirable in Avon, because I know that if this drastic measure goes through, it is only a matter of time until you also go after all the other villages or towns.
3. Page 1. I agree that ORVs have long served as a primary form of access to the beaches. We load up the SUV with coolers, fishing gear, tools and the kids and spend the entire day at the beach. My house is also handicapped friendly. How are these people able to enjoy the beach if you can not drive on the beach? These people also enjoy getting out of the sun by sitting in the car when the sun is too hot. This is why I also disagree with page 53.
4. Page 121-127. I disagree with the buffers as presented. Popping plover buffers should move with the brood and not expanded. The 1,000 meters is way too excessive. I would recommend 199 meters. The buffers for the other species should be 30 meters and not 300. Non-endangered birds should not have the same protection as if endangered.
5. Page 124. I strongly disagree with the NPS notion of overprotecting resource management and not the public's right to beach access. If the NPS was a body voted into office, I guarantee that they would have a different slant on this entire issue.
6. In general, the NPS proposals appear to ignore the wishes and long help preferences of the local citizens and local island communities.
7. Page xlvi, Alternative F is pictured as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small business. Tourists will stop coming, the real estate market will dry up. No need for fish and tackle shops. Summer tourists will not economically support the schools, police force or fire company. It would not surprise me if taxes doubled and with the economy in the tank, the local community can not support the existing system. Business's will lay off employees.
8. Page 270-286 & 561-598. I strongly disagree with the socio-economic data and result in an understatement of the effect of the restrictions will have upon the island and the region. The villages and towns of Hatteras will experience extreme and unrevocable economic harm if Alternative F is approved as is. Can the banks survive another rash of housing foreclosures?
9. Page 136. I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. And we do not own a pet. I would suggest a six foot leash requirement year round where pedestrians are allowed. I would also suggest a much higher penalty to owners who do not clean up after their pets.
10. Pages 125, 392-396 SEA TURTLES. I support other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as done in other state and federally controlled areas. I guess I do not understand all the sea turtle hoopla if Hatteras only produces 1% of all turtle nests.
11. pages 97-101. I cannot disagree more strongly with the proposal to restrict ORV's between ramps 27 and 30. What is the reason or what are you trying to protect in this area?
12. Page 104. I disagree with the proposed night time driving ban. I would suggest no night time driving from 10 PM until 4 AM.
13. Page 121. I disagree with the proposed beach closings from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available.

In conclusion, I would suggest a much smaller buffer area. As proposed, the buffers appear excessive and arbitrary. I think way too much time and energy is spent on protecting the Piping Plover, when I do not know if I have ever seen one. The only turtle that I have seen was a dead one on the beach. You should consider scaling back the buffers and they can be increased at a later date. I also wonder if all these restrictions are the origin of outside groups to keep all pedestrians and ORV's permanently off the beaches. Finally, we should "protect, not prohibit."

Ronald A. Hibbs

Correspondence ID: 13209 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:16:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep the beaches on the Outer Banks open!

Correspondence ID: 13210 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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.

p.s. I think we need to learn lessons from our Canadian friends. They don't allow people to go in and tear up their parks. I am going to Banff in two weeks and will have to pay an entrance fee every single day of the five days I am there. The fees are used to directly maintain the parks. That is common sense. We don't seem to have too much of that down here in USA. Let people who want to ride in motorized vehicles stay on paved roads where they belong. Motors and pavement, feet and soil. Common sense.

Correspondence ID: 13211 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:20:31
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: 13212 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:20:31
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: 13213 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:20:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13214 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:21:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I know you folks are faced with tough decisions every day, But to restrict the public access to surf fishing don't quite seem as it is in the best interest of all concerned (including the birds) It is our dues, license and fees that support the Wildlife Resources Commission. Our attendance to the sea shore provides income to lots of local businesses, which stimulates the economy for a large region. Wildlife Management has been successful in finding creative ways for Man and Beast to co-habitat in various scenarios all over the world. Why is it now the only way this bird can survive is to restrict taxpayers from enjoying the Public Land we have fought and paid for. I would plead with you to take a closer look at the impact to the people who pay your salary and reverse this easy fix plan you have carelessly put into place. Spend a little more time to research all options and come up with a new game plan that works for everybody.
Thank You
Terral Smith

Correspondence ID: 13215 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Mattingly, Sylvia
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep our beaches open for recreational use - horseback riding, fishing, walking, surfing, etc. It is vital to the people of Hatteras Island who make their living here for the beaches to remain open for people to freely use. I would not be able to stay on Hatteras without my Horseback riding business. Please put the welfare of Hatteras Island residents over everything else - birds, turtles, politics. Please protect the people.

Correspondence ID: 13216 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Dumbleton, John P
Received: May,10,2010 19:23:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Sir,
My family has been driving down to the Outer Banks for the last 18 years. We missed one year and we all sat home and cried. I was first reluctant to drive on the beach because I was afraid of getting my 4X4 stuck in the sand. However once I learned all the in and outs it was simple. I have taken more photo's of the birds coming up to within 2 feet of me than I have of the fish that I have caught. I have never seen a off roader harass or cause any damage to the wildlife on the beach or dunes. I have seen fishermen go out of their way to avoid harassing the animals. If the beach is closed down then my family and I will not be the only ones loosing out. The village of Buxton and the State of North Carolina will be the big losers.

Correspondence ID: 13217 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Spink, Rick
Received: May,10,2010 19:23:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: George Santayana was a famous philosopher who was quoted as saying basically "Fanaticism results in doubling your efforts while losing sight of your goals".
Point in case: before the environmentalist took over control of the NPS and the Cape Hatteras National Seashore RECREATION Area we frequently enjoyed riding north from Ramp 34 where we could watch the oyster catchers hatch new babies every year - in their roped off protected area, erected by the NPS, purposely away from the surf. We could observe and enjoy their development from week to week each time we were able to visit the RECREATION Area. But a few years ago control was taken from the NPS by the new boss in town (Audubon, DOW, SELC)- they saw fit to close the entire beach. The oyster catchers took advantage of their unrestricted area and apparently nested too close to the water. An inevitable storm occurred and the nest was over washed. No babies! No problem, no witnesses!!! Just another statistic though, to be used for the environmentalist cause.
Please return management responsibility to the NPS. The Audubon, DOW and SELC are blinded by fanaticism. They clearly want to turn the Cape Hatteras National Seashore RECREATION Area into a preserve area. It was never intended as such. We want control of our recreational park returned to the NPS for our responsible use. To think we may not even be able to walk our leashed dogs in the park in the future is absurd and epitomizes just how much lawyers and special interest groups (whose members statistically don't even patronize the recreation area) will do anything to impose their will without regard for real consequences.
WE'RE TIRED OF THE POLITICS, WE'RE TIRED OF THE BAD SCIENCE, AND WE ARE FED UP WITH THE LACK OF COMMON SENSE.
GIVE US BACK THE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATION AREA.

Correspondence ID: 13218 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Daddow, Carrie
Received: May,10,2010 19:24:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 13219 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:24:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

- 1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
- 2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
- 3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.
- 4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."
However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)
- 5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.
Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.
- 6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.
I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.
Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.
The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.
Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.
NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.
- 7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.
- 8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.
- 9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,
So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.
- 10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.
Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.
- 11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.
The Hatteras Island community has always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period when local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.
- 12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.
? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages
? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.
? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.
On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.
I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.
Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.
Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.
Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31. Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my rental company as their pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Dave Johel Hatteras Island Property Owner

Correspondence ID:	13220	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 19:25:59						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Sirs, Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages ? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts. ? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI. On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement. I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended. Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial. Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts. As a person who owns a vacation rental home for the past 15 years I have watch the rentals week reduced especially for the last couple years. I realize that the economy has changed but in my particular case many of my past renters chose my house because it being a well maintained older home, less expensive with excellent fish cleaning facilities. Since many were down to just fish the loss of access to the beach has made them change there choice of vacation/fishing locations. With the proposed reduced access more restricted plans for Hatteras Island in the future the decline will continue!! This overall decline is impacting me as well as filtering through the entire local economy. Visitors that once made this Island especially an "off" season area to visit will not return; not to mention the "in" season families that like to visit the more isolated beaches and have memorable times!!! Please understand I want my children to be able to show their children the same great things that the beaches of Hatteras Island have to offer as my						

Grandfather showed and told me. These restrictions will take that opportunity away forever.
 With much respect,
 Daniel L. Neal, Registered Professional Forester State of Maryland #266

Correspondence ID: 13221 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:27:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial

Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events.

Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

As a home owner on Hatteras Island, we of the Hatteras Island community have always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather

than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 13222 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 19:28:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue

to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial

Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

As a home owner on Hatteras Island, we of the Hatteras Island community have always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31. Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 13223 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 19:28:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support alternative A because Piping Plover nor any of the species proposed (oyster catchers, etc) to be protected by the ORV management plan are endangered and the Hatteras seashore area is not critical to their survival. The science is absolutely biased and incomplete for support of any plan except alternative A. This area was originally designated a "recreational area" and that is exactly what it is. It never was meant to be wholly a "preserve" for wildlife at the expense of enjoyment of the whole resource including complete access by ORV.

Correspondence ID: 13224 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:30:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: A lack of parking and access areas have contributed greatly to the number of vehicles on the beach. If you are wealthy and have a beach front home you have a virtual private beach, the public can not get access to the beaches with private property between highway 12 and the ocean. Those who are not within walking distance have few options but to drive on the beach. Most access areas require crossing highway 12, this is difficult and dangerous with children and the assorted items that go with them. More access areas AWAY from, not adjacent to the ramps are needed. The area in Frisco is an example of what should be, more areas like it are needed. In the summer the parking lot is usually full. If you doubled the parking capacity it would probably still fill up. Instead of trying to justify denying the public access to a public recreation area, why not try maximizing usage in areas where the birds are not likely to go. The beaches between Frisco and Hatteras village are perfect for that. Also on the subject of access. The handicap access at the Frisco area is excellent, good job. Why are there not more of them?

Correspondence ID: 13225 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:30:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: If you pass this regulation you will be causing damage to the people of the Island as well as Dare County. The County lost over \$2,000,000 in sales tax revenue alone last year not counting the income to the residents that live and work on Hatteras. You are requesting a much larger amount of land than is used on other beaches on the East Coast. You are also changing a way of life for the people. THE numbers you are using should be based on the Island not on numbers used by Kill Devils Hills. You are not protecting an endangered bird but making people endangered.

Correspondence ID: 13226 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Beschler, Ellen
Received: May,10,2010 19:34:14
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.

Correspondence ID:	13227	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 19:35:33						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.						
	1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.						
	2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.						
	3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.						
	4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors." However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)						
	5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.						
	6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.						
	7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.						
	8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.						
	9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%, So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.						
	10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreation Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.						
	11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan						

section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

As a home owner on Hatteras Island, we of the Hatteras Island community have always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fishermen want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 13228 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:35:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family has vacationed at the Outer Banks for decades. It is one of the few places where my husband can relax from his very stressful job. We like the Outer Banks so much we purchased a rental home in 2006 and each year spend our few free weeks exploring the Outer Banks, fishing in the surf, in

the sound and off the shore. The decision to close beaches to fishing and people enjoying the Outer Banks experience is very disturbing. I care about the health of the different birds and wildlife. But people aren't the only factors that influence the environmental change on the Outer Banks. People cannot control hurricanes or North-Eastern Winds that move sand and water--disrupting the nests of birds and wildlife. Since people want to preserve the Outer Banks, people repair roads and sand dunes. Birds and wildlife find other places to nest--they have adjusted to the whims of the wind and sand for centuries longer than humans populating the same islands! Common sense must reign in addressing the preservation of the birds and wildlife. Please keep the beaches open to fishing and people and allow dogs to walk on the beach (on a leash). Signage can encourage people to stay off the dunes and leave birds and wildlife in peace. Closing beaches has a tremendous economic impact on the State of North Carolina. People who come to fish and enjoy the Outer Banks need a place to stay, food to eat, stores to buy various sundries and fishing gear. Those demands provide jobs for many North Carolinians. The loss of revenue to the State is astronomical when overly strict rules to close beaches becomes a disincentive to people to come to the Outer Banks! There must be a compromise so that people have the freedom to enjoy the Outer Banks and the fishing opportunities it employs and allow peace for the birds and wildlife to flourish.

Correspondence ID: 13229 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Alper, Jeff
Received: May,10,2010 19:37:17
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: 13230 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:38:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Supt.Murray,
I am writing to implore you to keep the promise of past superintendants and protect the livlyhood and well-being of the residents of Hatteras Island. By adopting option A a balance can be maintained between protecting the wildlife in question and the economic health to one of the greatest recreational treasures in our nation. My husband and I are property owners in Frisco, and are concerned of the disasterous effects the adoption that plan F would have to the overall economic health of the entire county. Not only is plan F a certain death sentence to life on Hatteras Island as we know it, the plan is based on misleading and unproven data. The plan is reactionary and without an iota of concern for the thousands of hard working people who have made this area their homes for generations.The flexibility that Plan A proposes will allow small business owners to contine to survive by allowing changes that will keep areas of beaches open for fising. Without this access, the impact to the economy will be monumental, unlike the misleading and false conclusion of the proponents of Plan F. Please use your wisdom and good conscience to adopt Plan A that will protect the wildlife we treasure,along with the lives of thousands that make a living from all that Hatteras Island has to offer.
Respectfully, Janice Bofinger

Correspondence ID: 13231 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As the owner of a home on the Outer Banks 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 Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.
Our National Parks are treasured open spaces, and the National Seashore in particular is part of what makes the Outer Banks so unique among beach communities. There are plenty of areas on the Outer Banks where ORV are allowed. I would hate to see this expanse turned into either a parking lot or a racetrack for off road vehicles. I fail to see what would prevent it from becoming another off-road Corolla.
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 Kneeland

Correspondence ID: 13232 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:48:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a local resident of the Outer Banks.
 I believe that the DEIS is a political document that ignores scientific data and whose only purpose is to deny access. The DEIS ignores the fact that predation and storms/ocean overwash are the primary cause of decline in bird populations.
 Alternative F unnecessarily restricts ORV access at a level that is not supported by data. Alternative C is the least evil of all alternatives; however, none of the alternatives are appropriate in order to help the bird and turtle populations.
 The NPS should not be able to close resources for a state designated "species of concern" when that species (American Oystercatcher) is neither endangered nor threatened according to the ESA.
 The NC Wildlife Resources Commission supports access. They are the scientists that live here and have no political agenda. The NPS should not be allowed to cater to special interests, such as the Audubon Society, to the detriment of the local economy, the locals who will protect what they are allowed to enjoy, and the resource itself.
 The DEIS should be thrown in the trash and access prior to the Consent Decree should be the rule.
 Sincerely,
 Brooke Shive Coinjock, NC

Correspondence ID: 13233 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Whichard, Philip R
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast - accessible only by ORV.
 Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.
 I support Alternative A. In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community.
 Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.
 Sincerely,
 Philip Whichard 8433321250

Correspondence ID: 13234 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:50:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13235 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:50:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13236 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:50:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors." However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%, So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan

section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

As a home owner on Hatteras Island, we of the Hatteras Island community have always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fishermen want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 to July 31.

Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 to 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 to September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Correspondence ID:	13237	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Ungar, Luci				
Received:	May,10,2010 19:51:14				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Cape Hatteras National Seashore should NOT allow ORV's in it! Thank you!				

Correspondence ID: 13238 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:52:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe that Off-Road Vehicle do not belong in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13239 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hughes, Bob O
Received: May,10,2010 19:52:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=58&projectID=10641&documentID=32596
The motto of the Park service was "Recreation for the people and protection of the wild life". You have changes this to protection of the wild life from the people.
One of my greatest pleasures here is to have a care free walk on miles of beach enjoying the wind, birds and fish.
Your Desire seems to be to take that pleasure away and ruin the lives and home for many others.
Lest you think I am negative on Parks, let me tell you that I have VIP status with another park. When I visit a park I always start at the visitor center and sign up for hikes or nature activities.
I also inquire here about beach closures. None of your rangers can give a clear answer. They have maps with scales of no use to walkers. Yet, your enforcement people know exactly where to be to spoil a vacation for somebody.
Turtles: Last year you had very large turtle enclosures with an inner chamber near the old light house site. Your enclosures went from the water to the dunes. People had to walk in the water or on the dunes. The first rule I learned at the beach was DO NOT WALK on the dunes. The enclosures were so large that your staff drove their ATVs inside the enclosure.
You need to visit Topsail Island where volunteers mark nest sites erect enclosures large enough to protect the nest. You are missing a great opportunity to include volunteers in your turtle program.
I picked no trash for you this year or last. If you have the manpower to build huge enclosures then have enough people for trash clean up. How many bags did the bird watchers pick up for you?
Is it possible that the people who love to walk the beach, fish occasionally, love nature as much as you could form a SPECIAL INTEREST GROUP to which you would pay as much attention as you give to the bird watchers?
What is the nesting rate for Sanderlings and Willets? Is it increasing with the beach closures? I was told there were 10 Plover nest sights. Should we expect 20 this year due to you previous closure efforts?
Well you are about to get your Desire. A park with no tourist. I have asked my congressman to reduce your budget as you reduce our access.
Remember, with the Bird Watchers you will always be a servant. You could have been a partner with us.

Correspondence ID: 13240 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Holmes, Timothy L
Received: May,10,2010 19:53:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.
Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.
Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.
The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13241 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:54:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly opposed to this excessively restrictive plan.Are You using the Cape Cod N.S. model of restricting/denying access? Lets look at the 2009 plan instead.I have enjoyed visiting Hatteras and have encouraged others to do so.Please keep the beach open.Thank you,Henry Greene.

Correspondence ID: 13242 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:56:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area should have as it's primary focus exactly what it's title reflects, a recreational area for people. This is the purpose that it was established for and it should continue to be exactly that. Rules are important, but the present set is not supporting the recreation aspect.
The present direction of providing extreme protective status to species not currently on the endangered species lists is without merit. Where would this end?
The current process of expanding buffers based on any minor damage to the buffer could encourage those who wish to see the expansion commit an infraction just for that purpose. The process does not seem to attempt to locate a guilty party but punish the public. I do not see where the science that backs the current extreme boundaries, or any boundaries, is presented by the Park Service. Given the environment, I do not see how the birds can see or hear pedestrian or vehicular traffic close to the current range.
Regarding the turtle nests, it would seem that either these should be moved to protected areas or have minimal enclosures that do not extend to the surf. The turtle nests appear to be at the northern end of the habitat and not that productive compared to southern areas.
The closures of beach negatively impacts our family enjoyment of the beach. We utilize a vehicle to provide access to the beach for our family. Without the ability to drive on the beach, some family members would not be able to walk the distance necessary to reach the beach.
We need to return to the idea of people first and in these hard economic times support those people whom wish to enjoy the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area in the manner it was intended which in turn will support the local businesses.

Correspondence ID: 13243 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Midget, Bertie K
Received: May,10,2010 19:58:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I encourage you to consider something else to do besides close the beaches on Hatteras Island. I have already seen the damage that has been done just with the "little" closures you've done. My family has been born and raised on this island for centuries. We always had the right to walk, ride, play on the beaches. Now my grandchildren are in danger of loosing that right. I'm seeing business struggle with keep themselves a float. I've heard comments from vacationers, we're not coming back if we can't go on the beach and fish, etc. How would you like it, knowing that tomorrow your house payment can't be made because there's no business to support you (JOB). I'm not a person who believes in just killing animals of any sort, but God gave man dominion over all the earth. Man, named the fish, bird and all creeping things. Birds will move their habitat to another place if someone comes near their nest. Turtles aren't extent likes being said. You know it only took one Woman to take prayer out of schools, now its only taking one group of people to kill our island. How sad to know that in another decade it will be a ghost island because no one will come. What a shame and disgrace to stand by and see the hard working people that I grew up with loose it all. I want my grandchildren and friends to be able to walk and ride freely on our beaches. We're not just talking about one nest, we're talking about peoples lives and their living on Hatteras Island. The economy is bad enough, don't create more problems.

Correspondence ID: 13244 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 19:58:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
I'm a native and life-long resident of N.C. who has regularly enjoyed the historic and serene natural coastline of my state. As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is truly a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS MUST assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 13245 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: butler, rita
Received: May,10,2010 20:01:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: All park buildings should be insulated used wall or roof gardens. This would set a good example for the public.

Correspondence ID: 13246 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:09:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Murray,
Greetings sir i hope this comment finds you well and in good spirits. I want to start by saying that Im truly sorry such an idiotic and time consuming debate has had to come forth during your administration. The issues are plain. However the research and statistacal information are not. The piping Plover while having passed thru over the years, is not specifically indigenous to north carolina, therefore it is a serious waste of taxpayer money to fight for something that basically uses our state as a red roof inn to get its "Groove" on. As i understand there are 4 or less on hatteras at any given time. I also understand current events to read as NPS being responsible for running 20 of them to death in the name of research over the years. While only 1 death can be attributed to a non NPS human. I care not, believe me i forgive the NPS. No animal even unto the LAST of its kind should ever be allowed to interfere with human rights. Before 2007 the NPS did a stellar job. Im sorry this particular influential blowhard has been able to push forth this lawsuit to grievance you. Prior to 2007 you adequately roped off nesting sights and so forth. People did not go near them. The system worked. If the outer banks suffers from anything its LACK OF NPS manpower. If you had more rangers able to patrol this would be a mute issue.
Here are a few suggestions: 1 Increase nps manpower
2 Remove birds to pea island
3 Catch and swab a few birds for dna against the day cloning becomes perfected
4 (personally preferred) exterminate the birds, after all if they are not there well there is no reason for your organization to go to all this trouble.
Im also disturbed by this cry of unfairness by people who want to walk on the beach.
1 The outer banks will never be Wrightsville or Carolina beach the very idea is ludicrous.
2 The outer Banks is a rough, wild, and sometimes downright inhospitable place. In my personal experiance the last thing i would want to deal with on the obx is a beach setting like wrightsville or carolina where 10000 pedestrians are on the beach and what i like to call a 5 minute storm comes up. Now when i say 5 minute storm i dont mean a storm that lasts 5 minutes, i mean a storm that from the time you see the clouds you have 5 minutes to GET OFF the beach.
3 The local folks depend on the fishermen who come and drive out on the beaches to fish. I thought america stopped its genocidal tendencies after driving the native americans to being an endangered species. Perhaps not though seeing as how a few special interest blowhards have been able to elevate animals to a higher pedastal than human rights.
In conclusion I want it to be clear that the NPS was doing a fine job before this lawsuit. A few more rangers would be prudent to ensure the enforcement of the applicable restrictions. I agree with one of the speakers at the raleigh meeting when he asked that you not fall victim to political blackmail. I hope that common sense will prevail, and may god assist you in finding the way.
Thank you for your time, Chris Sewell

Correspondence ID:	13247	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 20:11:07						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	To whom it may concern. I sincerely hope that you choose to keep public access on the beaches. My ancestors on my father's side all came from Avon, Buxton, and Frisco. We always enjoyed our summers on Hatteras island. Driving on the beach, fishing from the point, surfing, riding horses on the beach, and having everything you may need close by in the truck. That may seem superficial but I don't think it should be a problem. We always respected the wildlife and never left any trash on the beach, I think most people would do the same. Afterall Hatteras is beautiful, and peaceful. I think you could hurt the island in the long run if you choose to close the beaches to 4X4's. Many people may choose to go elsewhere. My family and I would not but it would not be the same. Many of my fondest childhood memories are from the beaches on Hatteras island. Please keep the beaches open. Thank you and God bless!						
Correspondence ID:	13248	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,10,2010 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...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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 those of us who appreciate nature's silence and safety. Not ORV's racing up the beaches creating more pollution.						
Correspondence ID:	13249	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 20:12:44						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Vehicles does not belong in this fragile area.						
Correspondence ID:	13250	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Perry, Kyle L						
Received:	May,10,2010 20:13:20						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I disagree with the thousand meter closure for the piping plover, a bird which does not need more than 200 meters for protection, per the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Commission. Nowhere within the DEIS document does it state WHY there needs to be a thousand meter closure, nor does the document provide scientific evidence supporting the need for such a large closure. I disagree with page 419 of the DEIS. The closures for the North Carolina's "Birds of concern," should not be the same as the piping plover since, unlike the Piping plover, "birds of concern" are not under the Endangered Species Protection Act. According to Gordon Meyers, executive director of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, "State listed 'species of concern' -such as the American oystercatcher -do not require the extensive buffers and beach closures mandated for federally listed species such as the piping plover" as published May 9th in the Virginian-Pilot. I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian/ORV closure policies within the DEIS -these address the least significant factor affecting nest survival. The management plan should address the two most significant risks to nest survival, which are mammalian predation and strom/lunar tides. Eliminating predation habitat around the ponds near Cape Point and other similar areas, by clearing the brush and trees, would help nest survival because the nests would be farther away from the shore line and potential human interaction. This would provide the ultimate birding habitat -accessible to water, flat sandy areas free of predators. As a local business owner who's business caters to fisherman and tourists who enjoy beach fishing, we see a decline in business when Cape Point south to Frisco is closed to ORVs and pedestrians. A more restrictive plan favored by the NPS would only continue to deteriorate our business and others as well.						
Correspondence ID:	13251	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Wendler, Jeff						
Received:	May,10,2010 20:14:04						
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, Jeff Wendler						
Correspondence ID:	13252	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 20:20:36						

Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to ask that you please off-road vehicles out of Cape Hatteras.

Correspondence ID: 13253 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:20:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13254 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:20:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13255 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:20:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me 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, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

0012442

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

Correspondence ID: 13256 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:20:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
I've been coming to Buxton for 15 years. Appreciate the national seashore. Want the birds and turtles safe.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13257 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Dixon, Daniel W
Received: May,10,2010 20:21:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have vacationed and fished on the Outer Banks of North Carolina for many years in all seasons. In the last few years I have seen the impact of closed beaches on the economy of the people who try to make a living on those islands. I think it is a shame that certain groups are favored by the Federal government when animals as opposed to humans are involved and truth does not always prevail. I feel access to the beaches by vehicles are needed to keep the economy on the islands stimulated. Using real facts and common sense solutions for the birds, turtles, and humans can be solved. Make the areas for the birds based on what is really needed not some inflated area to please certain groups. Moving turtle eggs can be done. There are plenty of volunteers that would love to help relocate turtle eggs. Keep the park beaches available to vehicles, for people to see all of nature.

Correspondence ID: 13258 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:21:14
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: 13259 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:22:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing

beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%.

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

As a lifelong resident of Hatteras Island, we of the Hatteras Island community have always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the

assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs. 15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 13260 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 20:22:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events.

Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

As a lifelong resident of Hatteras Island, we of the Hatteras Island community have always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules.

(p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "?prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and

November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 13261 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: McCants, Bernie

Received: May,10,2010 20:22:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am an Associate in Medicine at Duke Medical Center Duke Clinical Research Institute at Duke Medical Center with 36 years of experience in clinical research. I have tried to critically review the 800+ page DEIS report as time allowed.

I made my first trip to the Outer Banks with my parents in 1961 and have been an ORV and pedestrian angler, shell picker and bird watcher for 2-4 weeks each year since the late 1960's. I have always felt I was a conservationist and environmentalist but never to the exclusion of allowing reasonable and responsible access to the Seashore

I disagree with the bulk of the management options (A-F) proposed in the DEIS but instead offer the well-reasoned management options proposed by the Coalition For Beach Access ORV Access Environmental Impact Position Statement (www.obpa-nc.org/position/statement.pdf).

Additionally:

Return to the corridors around non-ESA listed species during the breeding and nesting period to allow ORV and pedestrian access to non-critical portions of the beach. Expand and close to the water these area during the hatch window and until fledging. Just recently Gordon Myers, executive director of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, has stated NC never intended the beach closures and buffers the NPS has proposed. Implement moving, 200-meter buffers for piping plover chicks. These chicks are intensely monitored by the resource staff and the staff can move and adjusted closures. The 1000 meter buffer is punitive and not justified by science. Pea Island is a prime, ORV-free pedestrian area in close proximity Rodanthe-Waves-Salvo. This must be included in the calculations. Respectfully, exclusion of this area simply due to management by a different governmental entities is nonsensical and is non-inclusion of species of concern in areas in close proximity to the Seashore.

The NPS should implement a proactive strategy of protecting turtle nests and hatchlings as outlined in the white paper by Hardham and Davis: Sea Turtle Management ? A Common Sense Approach for the Cape Hatteras Seashore Recreational Area.

I am disappointed that NPS has chosen to present management options that subjugate visitor recreational opportunities - the reason for the creation of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area - to over-reaching resource management options that will do little to mitigate losses by predation and weather.

Correspondence ID: 13262 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Bofinger, Daniel

Received: May,10,2010 20:24:41

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Mr. Murry,

I am writing in regard to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement pertaining to beach access on Hatteras Island. As a property owner and visitor for over 20 years I am very familiar with the history and culture on Hatteras Island. I have also marveled at and studied the wildlife that inhabits the island. I strongly oppose Alternative F due to many missing elements and flawed scientific facts as it pertains to both endangered species and non-endangered species. This plan is clearly written to add protection to non-endangered species which is not the intent of a written access plan. Alternative F does not address the abundant dredge islands surrounding Hatteras Island that is an active breeding habitat for endangered birds. These dredge islands have no predators to the endangered species yet they were not considered in the study.

The economic impact from Alternative F on Hatteras Island would have a devastating impact to residents, property owners and businesses on the island. It would irradicate a culture that spans generations. I have seen the recent effects from the economy but more concerning how it has been exacerbated by the temporary restrictions to beach access.

A promise was made to keep President Roosevelt's vision of providing beach access to this great National Seashore. Alternative F is not a viable solution.

Dan Bofinger

Correspondence ID: 13263 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Wines, Dan A

Received: May,10,2010 20:25:48

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please consider my comments below upon review of the Cape Hatteras Draft ORV Management Plan/DEIS.

The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.

Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.

Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.

The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success.

More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13264 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: McCulloch, Joseph W
Received: May,10,2010 20:26:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel that beach access is too restrictive. Pets should be allowed as long as they are on a leash at all times. Access for watersports should continue to be permitted especially at the following locations: The Haulover (Canadian Hole) near (58) South of Avon Kite Point near (59) North of Buxton Frisco Day Use Area near proposed new ramp 51 Sandy Bay Soundside north of Hatteras Village
 These areas are much enjoyed for watersports and the parking and facilities are much appreciated by the many seasonal tourists. Canadian Hole and Kite Point have become an important and famous attraction for the Outer Banks.

Correspondence ID: 13265 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Jurjans, Janis E
Received: May,10,2010 20:30:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with many items in the management plan. Especially closing access to areas that have been historically open and prohibiting leashed pets in the seashore at any time.

Correspondence ID: 13266 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Suarez, Juan I
Received: May,10,2010 20:32:17
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: 13267 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Epping, Jessica A
Received: May,10,2010 20:37:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with page 136 of the DEIS that supports the prohibition of pets in the seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages. This essentially prohibits pets from all public areas of the National Park including beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foottrails and park maintained roads - even though the majority of these areas do not have piping plover nests or closures associated with nests and therefore, dogs would not pose any potential threat to the birds.
 Furthermore, pets must be on a leash on the beach and it is the NPS responsibility to manage the park and ensure that pets are on a leash as part of all rules that must be obeyed such as bonfires below high tide line. As responsible citizens enjoying our national park that we pay for, it is absurd to prohibit pets from the park without sound scientific evidence and proof of the potential threat dogs pose to nests. The DEIS does not document any past events where a dog has hurt or threatened a nest.
 Our economy depends on tourism to survive. Each property management company recognizes the popularity and demand for pet friendly accommodations in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational area. Each company has "pet friendly" as a searchable amenity. The fact that so many vacation rental homes are pet friendly proves the importance of continuing to allow free and open access to the beaches and all National Park public areas for pets. Locals and tourists alike are well informed of the leash law and respect the leash law.
 The DEIS does not document or outline the potential harm to the local economy if pets are prohibited in the seashore, in front of the villages and essentially in all public places within the National Park. To propose the prohibition of pets, without concrete evidence to support their perceived danger to nests, and without identifying the potential economic harm this could cause, does not provide a sound argument.

Correspondence ID: 13268 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:38:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with nps plan for beach management due to the fact that it is entirely unjust and not based on any facts that the animals they are try to protect are negatively affected by human presence.we need real studies on the affect of humans on nesting animals on the beaches of cape hatteras before such a potentially devastating plan to the local community is put into place.thanks in advance...Caleb,resident of cape hatteras and business owner for over 15yrs

Correspondence ID: 13269 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:40:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15. 4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc) 5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well. 6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial

Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. 7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access. 8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS. 9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%, So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park. 11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues. As a lifelong resident of Hatteras Island, we of the Hatteras Island community have always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities. 12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages ? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts. ? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI. On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out. Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of

access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed. Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS. 14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31. Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs. 15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Jay Hughes

This is in agreement with fellow friend Stewart Couch's recommendations.

Correspondence ID: 13270 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Heilig, Jason B
Received: May,10,2010 20:40:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments. I agree that we humans should respect nature and avoid altering the natural course of life and it's cycles. This can be done harmoniously without excessive measures. I disagree with your statement (p. 210)in the DEIS which states "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." The facts are that no Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. As we continue to educate through signage and other means, ORV violations continue to decrease. I agree with your statement (p.1) in the DEIS which states that "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors". Many of the activities enjoyed on the seashore require recreational equipment that is best transported by way of ORVs. Pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments , families with small children, and those who to engage in activities requiring the aforementioned recreational equipment. On (p.58) you mention Special Use permits to allow transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches. While the premise of this is logical, I disagree with requiring the vehicle to be returned to the street; as this creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of emergencies which are more likely to occur with those disabled or those who have health risks. On (pages 121-127) I don't agree with the size nor inflexible buffers. These buffers should allow for ORV pass-through only corridors. There should also be pass-through only corridors for pedestrians. Again, we can protect and live harmoniously with birds, turtles etc... with proper education and enforcement, not by totally denying access. I disagree with your proposed buffers for Breeding/Nesting as they are too large and excessive. Where you propose 75m, I propose 50m. Where you propose 300m, I propose 30m. I disagree with your buffers for unfledged chicks. Where you propose 1000m, I propose 200m. An example of how excessive 1000m is should be directed to Cape Point in Buxton. 1000m would totally shut off the whole point. In some areas, 1000m would shut off hwy 12. I disagree with your 5 year periodic review process identified in the DEIS with regard to initiatives such as Vegetation Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Piping Plover chick buffer distance etc...and propose that these initiatives be considered more frequently. These initiatives are logical but need to be reviewed more frequently given the fact that this is a new process. I disagree with your highlighting of the least significant factor affecting nest survival regarding birds: HUMANS. Consider these statistics with regard to AMOY nest failures: Mammalian Predation: 54% Highly significant risk. Storm/Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation 5%, Ghost Crab Predation: 3%, Human Interference: 3% INSIGNIFICANT IMPACT. Again, thank you for your time and please consider my comments as well as all others.

Correspondence ID: 13271 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hartnett, John J
Received: May,10,2010 20:40:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

I disagree with all options contained in the Draft ORV Management Plan. The options are all extreme and biased. I have had many visits over the years on the Outer Banks and do not think there is a need for such ridiculous closures. I disagree with the proposed closures because of the lack of understanding of this fluid environment. Nor'easters and Hurricanes kill more species on Hatteras Island than any other factor. Keep it Natural? The NPS has systematically killed off the predators of the island. There has also been an effort to eliminate the ghost crab which used to be so plentiful it appeared as though sand was moving. Most outrageous is the elimination of owls from Hatteras Island as they were deemed to be predacious to the migratory birds. The rhetoric concerning the economic and cultural aspects of the island is ruining the stability of this sensitive community. There are no hard facts to back up the numbers brought forth. Most disappointing is the lack of input from those families that have lived on the island for hundreds of years and

were always promised access.

I am a conservationist at heart. I do not see how letting turtle eggs drown and not moving bird eggs that are about to be washed over can be part of the management plan. Why isn't Pea Island acknowledged as an already existing refuge for birds and a prime pedestrian area? Why isn't the success of the dredge spoils island considered? Species that are not on the endangered species list should not have closures consistent with those birds that are on the endangered list. Bird activity of the entire island needs to be assessed not just the areas in the National Park.

Why has the cultural practice of mowing the Cape Point Pond banks been discontinued when it brought so much success for so many years? Many of the rules being made up are being brought forth by those that do not live or vacation on the island. I do not agree on legislating from the bench. Those who live on the island should be allowed to be more involved in this process.

Cape Hatteras will incur excessive costs building parking lots and other facilities to accommodate people who would otherwise have access to the beach. I believe that building these things will be more detrimental than allowing access. When the beaches were reopened after the extended closure last year they were a mess because we were not there to clean them. That is what makes this area unique. We care about it, we take care it. Expelling those that break the law is a must. Do not let those that break the law ruin the law abiding citizen's time on the island.

I will be contacting my congressman and senator to voice my concerns on this proposed management plan.

John Hartnett

Correspondence ID: 13272 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:43:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the Alternative E and F. As a property investment owner, I'm concerned about the restrictive nature of these proposals. The limitation of beach access and pet walking on Outerbanks beaches could greatly impact the rental business. Limiting beach access from March 15 - July 31st will have a great impact on our rental property. The environmental impact for restricting this access is not clearly known and thereby just a restriction guessing game. Management of this beautiful area must take into consideration the livelihood of all concerned. Humans as well as animals deserve consideration. To limit access solely on incomplete data could GREATLY affect the economic impact of the entire state of NC. In this economic downturn, is North Carolina willing to take the chance that it won't have an impact on business and that business will be able to adapt to the new restrictions? That's a gamble I hope your not willing to take.
I strongly disagree with the piping plover unfledged chick brood situation that has occurred in the Outerbanks. As an elementary school teacher, I teach the Ecosystem to fifth-graders. An important part of every ecosystem is adaptation. Animals either adapt, move or become extinct. The protection of birds living outside their natural habitat is morally incorrect. Natural predators to the Outerbanks have kept this unnative bird from adapting to the area and that has caused the piping plover numbers to remain small. By providing a protected area, the bird is able to breed and multiply but it will only do so with CONTINUED protection because it has not adapted to its new habitat naturally. Humans are providing an unnatural habitat and protection that nature is not. Let nature take its course and if the non-native piping plover can adapt to the Outerbanks, it will be able to multiply in numbers on its own without the intervention of humans. If this bird requires human intervention, than I suggest a zoo research facility where hatchlings can be freed into their native environment where they will naturally survive.

Correspondence ID: 13273 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page six and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.
4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."
However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)
5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.
Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.
6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.
I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.
Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.
The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.
Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.
NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.
7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.
8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social

attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

Correspondence ID: 13274 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: anderson, seth n
Received: May,10,2010 20:46:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: our national parks are for preserving nature. pretty simple.

Correspondence ID: 13275 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:47:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: First I'm going to list a few brief concerns about the DEIS, followed by a more personal essay that I wrote last summer about my observations of the effects of the "Consent Decree", as well as some misconceptions perpetrated by the NPS. It was meant to be a response to an article in the Raleigh News & Observer, however I never published the entire essay because of character restrictions on their website.

1) The buffers are not based on "peer reviewed" science 2) What is the difference between "threatened" & "endangered"? 3) Why are birds that are considered "threatened" given the same buffer as those which are considered "endangered"? 4) Considering the turtles- The NPS should utilize strategies used else where in the United States, which were successful. (During the last meeting I attended, we weren't given any authentic, conclusive evidence regarding turtle numbers on Cape Hatteras. We were only told about what happened on a beach in Daytona Beach, Florida. The woman who did the presentation gave us a lot of vague answers, often contradicting what she had said moments before.) 5) The data used to prepare the DEIS needs to be authentic & validated by a real panel of scientists. A lot of the information we were presented with during the meetings that took place before this DEIS, was full of theories & conjecture, & comes from research papers written by students. According to the EPA the data is supposed to be reviewed by real scientists before it can be considered "law".

"Observations on the effect of recent politics & the reality of living on Cape Hatteras"
 by Jay Balfie, Summer, 2009

I've worked here 7 years & this is by far the slowest year, business wise. Even when you drive by the parking lots there are a lot of empty spaces, more than usual. I talked to someone who works at one of the local businesses here in Buxton & they told me that usually after the 4th of July things are pretty steady, but that this year the week following July 4th was "early quiet". From what I've seen, I believe that the week following July 4th was relatively quiet, compared to previous years. In the restaurant that I work in, it was also unusually quiet after the 4th. Here we are in the summer & we're having days mid week that feel more like the fall season than the summer. Contrary to what was said here in an article, people that were visiting this year, did know there were problems regarding the beach. We had many customers ask what was going on with it. I had one customer say to me: "We knew there was something wrong right away, because when we drove over the Bonner Bridge there were no cars down below. The beach was completely empty & there were also signs all over the side of the road, the whole way down the beach." At that point we decided to put informative flyers on the tables & by the register. I've talked to business owners on Ocracoke, who also say this is one of the worst years they've ever had. One business owner in particular in Ocracoke told me that last year he made more money in one day, then he has on an entire weekend this year. He also mentioned something else that I hadn't thought about. He said "this place doesn't exactly feel warm, friendly & inviting". "When you turn the corner at Whalebone Junction onto highway 12, you don't see a bright & colorful sign that says "Welcome To Cape Hatteras Recreational Area", you instead see an enormous black traffic sign that says: "BEACH DRIVING AT NIGHT PROHIBITED", & "FIREWORKS PROHIBITED". When I was riding the ferry last week, I talked to a family from Maryland that had been coming to Buxton for 25 years. She told me that they were confused when they got here, because the signs up at Whalebone Junction said that only night driving was prohibited, so they thought they could still get on the beach during the day. Then when they arrived in Buxton, they were surprised that they couldn't fish their favorite spot out at The Point, even during the day. So since the point was closed they instead sought out a campground further down the road that was closer to a small beach area that was open for driving. So that would solidify my belief in the fact that closures have & will continue to effect business, the longer they go on. The classic excuse of the "special interest groups" (Audobon, Defenders of Wildlife, & SELC) is that the entire economy is a mess, which is true to a degree. However, to say that extensive beach closures to pedestrians & ORV drivers, will not affect an area that predominately depends on tourism, is absolutely ridiculous. It's ludicrous that both Daniel Wenk & Derb Carter feel that the closures were a "success". The fact is that nobody can predict exactly what mother nature will do. The turtles don't think like we do. They're not swimming around out in the ocean thinking, "Oh great, there are less cars on the beach, now we can get up there & lay more eggs than we did last year!" Nobody knows exactly why they do what they do. I would say that they act on some primitive biological impulse. Maybe they just happened to swim to our beach this year & not some where else. The same thing goes for the birds. I noticed that in the recent articles by the Virginia Pilot & Raleigh Observer, they said that the animals were "vulnerable" not "endangered". So please tell me what exactly is the difference between "vulnerable" & "endangered"? Piping plovers exist all over U.S. & Canada & their numbers are up, not down. I just don't believe that the environment is benefitting from recent closures which is a matter of weeks. Bird populations do not increase in a matter of weeks. It takes years of close scientific study by real scientists, to determine whether those numbers are up or down & although I'm not a scientist, I'm sure there are several factors which go into determining that, such as storms & tide which have amazingly not been discussed by anyone. Over the years, bird & turtle areas have always been roped off & those areas for the most part have been respected. I also noticed on my last trip to Ocracoke that all the beaches there are open again. All the roped off signs by the road side had been taken down. I thought it was a pretty dramatic thing that everything over there had been opened back up. When talking to a store owner, I asked why the beaches had suddenly reopened, & he said that the tide had come up high a few weeks ago & washed away all the nests. I couldn't help but chuckle at the irony. Isn't that one of the things that we "the intervenors" brought up? That storms & tides have always affected the breeding habits of shore birds here on Hatteras Island? I can't believe that the Park Service, SELC, Audobon, or Defenders of Wildlife never considered this. This goes way beyond ORV driving on the beach & arguments over replacing the Herbert C. Bonner Bridge. It is all part of a large scale effort of multiple special interest groups to privatize a recreational area which has always been open to the public. Thus far, the case has been handled poorly. No authentic, peer reviewed, scientific evidence has been presented. There has also been no study or consideration of the economic impact this will have on the island communities. The judge who issued the "Consent Decree" has had family involved in an altercation on a Hatteras beach, which is an enormous conflict of interest. He shouldn't even have been given the case. The judge also has never been here & has only read about the islands on paper. Judge Terrance Boyle is not supported by the North Carolina Bar Association & has a known track record for siding with special interest groups. So why is such a critical decision given to somebody who is biased & prejudiced? The Piping Plovers have already been given to much space as it is. Restriction & closing of Cape Point during the summer months will continue to hurt local businesses & it will also hurt the Park Service itself as well. Who will want to camp at the Cape Point Campground if they can't even walk on the beach? How will they be able to afford to pay all the extra Park Service attendants, when nobody wants to use the campgrounds anymore? Why are the nesting areas of the Terns still roped off when they're under water? Is a buffer zone of 2 football fields really necessary for birds that are technically not considered "endangered"? Why was it not considered to use Portsmouth island as a bird refuge, where there is plenty of uninhabited, undisturbed shoreline? Why has the Park Service been allowed to kill thousands of endangered Grey foxes & other "endangered" animals (in broad daylight)? Why has the Herbert C. Bonner Bridge not been replaced, when the funding has been approved since 1994? Is a ferry system really a safe efficient means of transportation in a storm prone area? Why has there been such a lack of consideration of human lives in a vacation area which generates a large amount of revenue for the

state of North Carolina? Jim Cantore scared away & ruined business last September by exaggerating a "North Easter" storm. He returned this season to do an expose on local businesses. He only covered 2 or 3 local businesses & that was it. How come he didn't discuss the "Consent Decree", or the politics which are destroying the island communities? Recently there have been events where a lack of decision making has cost the lives of thousands of people. The bridge collapse in Minneapolis Minnesota & a lack of communication & evacuation procedures in New Orleans where thousands of people lost their lives in hurricane Katrina. In these times of "going green" & "green consciousness" it is confusing to know what & who is right or wrong. Just because we're "going green" doesn't mean we have to go blind. Obviously as our natural resources are running low we need to find new fuel & energy alternatives. Just because we believe in these things doesn't mean we have to close a recreational area which has always been open to the public. Recently the size of the turtle area at the "Old Lighthouse/Jetty" was increased. What I would really like to know is how do we know the person who did it, is not affiliated w/ the NPS or one of the "special interest groups"? I seriously doubt the integrity of the NPS. It's been documented on this website that they've killed a plethora of animals such as Grey foxes, & Ospreys in order to save Piping Plovers. The U.S. Fish & Wildlife wants to completely shut down the entire lighthouse beach in Buxton. Their idea of conservation is to kill endangered grey foxes & other animals on the beach, in order to help birds that are not even technically considered "endangered". It seems a bit counter productive & hypocritical to kill animals in order to preserve others. There are only a small handful of parking lots along Cape Hatteras where you can park & safely walk over a ramp or stairs to the ocean. As we speak, restrictions are being placed on these areas. This is not just about fishing, this will restrict all activities: Surfing, hiking, sun bathing, windsurfing, & kiteboarding, & any other activity you can think of that takes place on the beach. The numbers regarding the miles of open beach are very misleading. While the Point was closed there may have been 55 miles of "open beach", however, you would have to pull over the side of the road & risk getting your vehicle stuck in the sand, as well as you'd have to cross highway 12 which is a very busy road during the summer. Then once you get across the road, you'd have to walk up a steep dune & hop over a sand fence to get to the beach on the other side. I've read all the history regarding these issues. I understand that this all began back in the 70's w/ Richard Nixon saying that there needs to be a management strategy for the Cape Hatteras Recreational Seashore. I don't disagree that the beach is over crowded w/ vehicles during the summer, & that there needs to be some basic rules about the beach driving such as: slacking tires, having tow cables, jacks, flashlights, etc, but this mentality that "we need to shut it all down" is wrong. There are such things as compassion and compromise & so far the special interest groups such as SELC, Audobon & Defenders of Wildlife have showed no signs of these virtues. They seek only to further their own agenda of financial gain & privatization. I'm also suspicious of the NPS inadvertently destroying turtle & bird nests. Anyone who's been out on the beach at night knows that they drive higher up next to the dune line then other vehicles do. Privatization is unconstitutional as it denies us basic human rights such as freedom of choice & freedom of economic prosperity. I say this because we have not been given any choice in matters that will affect us personally. Some people in the near future may not even be able to go swimming in the ocean or walk on the beach in front of their home. It will also become more difficult for people to adequately provide for their families. The people who pushed for these regulations are selfish. Most of these people don't even live here, or they are either retired, or they visit here maybe 2 weeks out of the year. So they either do not care, or just have no clue what it's like to live here year round & earn a living. Something that should be understood is that when you invite the government to make regulations, this will eventually lead to more decisions being made without our input. Gradually our freedoms slip away, & before we know it, we can't even walk in our front yard. Be careful who you support & be sure of their motives. Please think about this. If the "Old Lighthouse Beach" is closed, there will be no fishing, swimming, hiking, surfing, sun bathing, kiteboarding, etc. There would be no ESA tournament & there would also be no Drum tournament in the fall which Buxton businesses depend on, just to break even. I read that Chris Canfield very recently said that he'd been to Hatteras for a 2 day visit & said that things were going great & that the management plan was working & that bird numbers are up. It is correct to say that the numbers for the Plovers & Oyster Catchers are up, but that is only because the way that the beach had been managed in recent years was working. I'm really curious how Chris Canfield can come down here for 2 days & pretend to know everything about this complex island community? I think it's great that the editor of the Island free press acknowledged Chris Canfield, Jason Rylander & Derb Carter as people who are only doing what they feel is right. However, I will have to continue my skepticism of their beliefs & sincerity, for the lack of concern that they've continued to show towards the people who live here on Hatteras & Ocracoke. Especially since they've presented no solid, recent, authentic, peer reviewed, scientific evidence to support their case. At the meetings I was surprised at the demeanor of the attorneys representing the environmental groups. Local people gave very passionate, detailed speeches about how the beach closures were effecting them, & these guys sat there, blank & callous, like they were bored & didn't really care about the people or what they felt & endured. I do agree that folks need to be mindful of these "wanted" posters that have been posted locally. I think the "I Support Open Beach Access" bumper stickers are great. However, putting up posters with hateful comments about locals only serves to make us look like a bunch of drunken shotgun wielding savages. I think it's extremely important to get the facts out there to folks. I've taken a look at the Defenders of Wildlife website & they still continue to misrepresent the facts. If you take a look at their website & the pdf's regarding the beach closures, they also say that the beach should not be managed by "special interest groups". When they say this, they mean US... the OBPA & the NC Beach Buggy Association, & basically anyone who lives on Cape Hatteras. They make it sound like they're on our side, when in fact they're not. One must look closely to understand how these groups operate. This is also why I'm still skeptical of their sincerity regarding these issues. On the surface they've made it look like a bunch of redneck "special interest groups" squabbling over beach access, when really this goes much deeper than that. To me this looks like it can affect peoples human rights, because people live & own property on or near the closures & own businesses that rely on tourism. There have been recent acts of vandalism. My question is: How do we know that it isn't the bird watchers & environmentalists who are doing the vandalism? They know that the "buffers" will be increased if there are problems. So perhaps they decided to use this to their advantage. Maybe they go out on the beach at night & tear down signs because they know it will automatically be blamed on other locals who oppose the recent closures. They are just as angry & upset if not more so then then the folks who live here. Vandalism should be investigated & dealt with on an individual basis. Our community should not be penalized as a whole & have to suffer because of this. Special interest groups have always bordered on fanatical & have been known to engage in illegal activities. When I lived in California, I met people who thought that smashing the store front windows of The Gap was the best way to explain to the public that The Gap corporation was supporting clear-cutting of old growth Redwood forests. Violence & vandalism will not resolve any issue, political or environmental. When you talk about vandalism, your completely missing the point here. This goes beyond vandalism on the beach. This is large scale privatization & rural gentrification & it's unconstitutional. Very recently in an island free press article Mike Murray said: "We had difficulty finding experts to back up the interim strategy." Obviously the plaintiffs had no problem paying an independent company to do a biased, incomplete, haphazard study of the area. Sitting here at my computer I've found plenty of information supporting that the "interim strategy" was working just fine. Even if you go on the U.S. Fish & wildlife website, even they were saying the numbers regarding the birds nation wide were up & not down. The following information was taken from a U.S. Fish & Wildlife website: "Atlantic coast the Piping Plover numbers have increased from 790 pairs in 1986 to 1,386 pairs in 1999" (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service). Also according to this document: <http://fresc.usgs.gov/products/ppl/> "Overall winter numbers were very high..." & "Breeding season numbers also appear higher than 2001 in general." So if I was able to simply click on a website & ascertain this information then why was Mike Murray & the NPS not able to find any information to use in court? After all, it is their job to protect the parks & make them available for people to use. They should know more about the animals here then anyone. If Mike Murry & the rest of the NPS really cared about keeping the beaches open, they should have been documenting animal habitats decades ago. The fact that they didn't have any evidence to defend themselves in court, is not only lazy, but completely irresponsible. It shows me that they didn't really care whether the beaches stayed open or not. Lets step away from the internet for a moment. Anyone who lives here & spends a lot of time on the beach & in the water, knows where the birds are & understands how they adapt to the environment which is ever changing because of storms & tide. I was down at the bath house beach a month or so ago & I saw at least a dozen Skimmers flying around, happily doing their thing. I didn't see any Park Service official, nor any bird watcher with binoculars. In fact, I don't think anyone knew they were there, except for myself. Again, I also saw dozens of these birds on a dredge island during a ferry ride to Ocracoke. To say that these birds are gone, would be incorrect. They obviously move, according to changes in their environment. I don't need any Park Service or biology credentials to figure out that the birds are still here & they move around. Even Mike Murray said: "We're running around closing areas, and then we are moving the closures as the birds move.... We are chasing the birds." "The long-term plan has got to be different from the consent decree and the interim plan." He went on to say that a possible solution could be to identify areas that the birds like and just say they will be closed from this date to this date." Once again I criticize that statement because it does not take into consideration the economic impact it would have on the community. If you close the entire Cape Point for the summer then whose going to want to stay in Buxton & eat at any of the restaurants or visit any of the shops? Furthermore, closing the entire Old Lighthouse beach/Jetty area as the U.S. Fish & Wildlife proposed for "Critical Habitat Designation" for the Piping Plover, would severely damage the small businesses here in Buxton. Obviously if you can't fish or surf one of the most popular places on the island or the east coast for that matter, then why would you want to stay here? When I first visited Cape Hatteras I was in awe of the freedom. I couldn't believe that you could drive your car right up to the ocean, hop out & go jump in the ocean

0012453

& swim, all without paying! I think the freedom here is a very large part of the beauty & mystique. I grew up in Connecticut going to Rhode Island & Cape Cod beaches. In Cape Cod, even if you a resident you still have to pay for a beach permit sticker for your car. Regardless of whether you a resident or tourist, if you don't have a sticker on your vehicle, you'll get towed because there are officers that patrol the parking lots hourly looking for vehicles without permits. You also cannot have fires on the beach at all. At Misquamicut State Beach in Westerly Rhode Island they not only make you pay for parking, but you also have to pay for the shower & bathroom facilities! The small strip of beach there is so over crowded that you literally trip & fall over people as you try to walk in between the beach blankets. There are so many blankets on the beach that you cannot even see the sand. Rocky Neck State Park in Connecticut is over crowded & uncomfortable. Of course you cannot drive on the beach there, there are no fires allowed on the beach & you have to pay for parking. The ocean there is a brownish black. It's been & continues to be polluted thanks to the nearby Pfizer plant. Folks, please think about the decisions you make regarding the beach. The beach here is our livelihood. Don't let Cape Hatteras & Ocracoke turn into ghost towns. More beach closures will lead to more & more regulations which will destroy that which makes this unique microcosm so special.

Correspondence ID: 13276 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gray, Bonnie
Received: May,10,2010 20:48:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep the beaches open, I am a kiter and would like to see kite point open to the public.
Thank you

Correspondence ID: 13277 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cash, Stuart
Received: May,10,2010 20:48:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am strongly in favor of protecting wildlife and their habitat. I am also strongly in favor of allowing humans to enjoy the beauty and recreational use of Hatteras island in a reasonable manner. When these two goals conflict, I would ask that our government makes an effort to balance them. Many of the proposed restrictions seem to favor the wildlife over the humans, and I have to disagree with that.
Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS plan of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.
I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,
So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3% ! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.
Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."
However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, surfboards. fishing rods and tackle, etc).
Thank You, Stuart Cash

Correspondence ID: 13278 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:48:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My name is Corey Bennett, I'm a 24yr old Mechanic and avid 4wd enthusiast as well as someone who thoroughly enjoys nature and just being outside, the beach especially. I've been coming down to the Nags Head/Cape Hatteras area with family and friends for 15yrs or more since I was just a kid. I can understand perfectly what you are trying to do with preserving nature in this area and I'm all for it, but to deny responsible access to beaches that this area has enjoyed and used to attract tourism and business as well as recreation due to some birds that aren't even endangered is quite frankly unacceptable and irresponsible on YOUR part. Sea turtle nests are also a big concern and I can also understand the need to preserve and help the turtles, these nests are moved all the time in other parts of the country to safer areas where there will be no people traffic aside from the qualified scientists there to monitor and study them to interfere or affect them in any way. Why can't similar methods be used in this case, surely this would save the lives of more baby sea turtles then leaving them on beaches travelled by people. I'm not going to pretend to have all the answers to this situation, BUT closing the beaches is NOT the answer to this situation.

Correspondence ID: 13279 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:49:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Overall, I have general concerns on the ORV Management plan. The more I read it the worse it seems. Based on how the beach has been managed since the consent decree much of the F and certainly D seem like convoluted ways to ultimately eliminate ORV traffic from the seashore. That would be tragic for the visitors and residents. Please use some rational judgement instead of resorting to layer after layer of rules to eliminate human presence from the seashore.
I prefer a combination of C and F with modifications as listed later. Mostly to accommodate more night driving, smaller closures in nesting areas, and pass through corridors. .
An ORV management plan is required; however the NPS is recommending drastic restrictions without any data to show a specific benefit. All published reports show that ORV traffic is very low on the list of impacting Piping Plover and Turtles but the proposed restrictions are major. ORV and pedestrian use is vital to a strong park. Long term parks protection depends on people who care about the park. If people are not able to see and use the Park then long term general public support will diminish. I know it is debatable, but if no one ever sees the protected environment and all the species does it really matter if they exist?
Management and restrictions must match benefits Stricter protection needs to be in line with the potential species benefit. Species protection and use should be balanced on potential benefit and impact to usage. The proposed measures are out of balance with the best case species benefits gained at CAHA. NC is on the southern end of the Piping Plover nesting area, and since 1992, according to USFWS data NC has accounted for an average of only 3.3% of the East coast breeding pairs. The breeding pairs at Cape Hatteras since 1992 have averaged only .6% of the total East Coast population. Statistically it would seem that nothing we do at CAHA will materially impact the East Coast Plover population?.but it will impact the use and local economy.
NPS has not shown correlation to ORV traffic and protected species. The decline in Piping Plover nesting at Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore over the last 20 years most likely relates to the dramatic increase in development in the late 90's early 2000's and the associated impact of developments such a decreased habitat and predator growth. The recent slight rebound in PIPL nesting is most likely attributable to the aggressive predator control

implemented in 2007. During the time of decreased PIPL nesting, CAHA recreation and ORV use has remained relatively constant and thus does not appear to have any impact on the PIPL population.

The Endangered Piping Plover (PIPL) species has been monitored on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore for the last 20 years. The CAHA nesting population of the PIPL remained relatively constant until 1997, when it took a dramatic downturn during the period 1997 to 2001. After 2001 nesting remained constant in the 2-4 nest range until 2007 when an aggressive predator control program was implemented. While the impacts are not completely understood the most likely influencers in PIPL nesting on CAHA are development and predator control. The chart below shows a direct relation to the increase in building permits and decline in nesting, while also a direct increase in nesting in 2007 with the introduction of predator control. Recreational use of CAHA, including ORV, has remained relatively constant over the last 19 years, peaking in 2002, and does not appear to have any direct relation to the PIPL nesting behavior.

From 1997 to 2001 the number of annual PIPL nests decreased from 16 to 3, an 81% reduction. The other major change in the CAHA area during this time was a huge increase in development. Housing units increased dramatically from 1997 to 2001. Only 233 residential units building permits were issued in 1997, while in 2001 944 permits were issued. In the 5 year period (1997 to 2001) 3397 residential building permits were issued, a 77% increase over the previous 5 year period (1992-1996). This dramatic increase in building brought higher population and summer tourists to the villages surrounding CAHA which in turn may have increased predator growth. This potential impact is noted in the USFWS Piping Plover Recovery plan where human activity and the associated garbage increases predators such as raccoons and feral cats. This study notes that "Predation has been identified as a major factor limiting piping plover reproductive success at many Atlantic Coast sites."

From 2001 to 2006 CAHA PIPL nesting stayed constant in the 2-4 nest range until 2007 when PIPL nesting increased dramatically to 10 nests in 2007, 13 in 2008, and 9 in 2009. The most significant change in the CAHA management at that time was the introduction of an aggressive predator control plan where natural PIPL predators (fox, opossum, raccoon, mink and feral cats) were aggressively trapped and exterminated. In the time period from 2002 to 2006 a total of 247 predators were exterminated, an average of 50 per year. In 2007, 304 predators were exterminated in CAHA, a 6x increase over 2006. This continues with 382 exterminations in 2008 and 464 in 2009.

Recreational and ORV Use Recreational use of CAH remained relatively constant from 1997 to 2001 with a 10% fluctuation. While usage peaked in 2002, the visitation has remained constant in the 2.2M-2.6M user range. ORV usage as a percentage of recreational users seems to have remained constant over the last 10 years (is there documentation for this?). Since the consent decree was put in place ORV and pedestrian use has been restricted however PIPL nesting has shown no constant trend. PIPL nesting was up 30% YtY in 2008 and down 30% YtY in 2010.

Sources PIPL Nesting Piping Plover Cape Hatteras National Seashore, 2009 Annual Report

<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=358&projectID=13331&documentID=31872> Predator Control: American Oystercatcher Monitoring on Cape Hatteras National Seashore, National Park Service. Doug McGee, Lead Avia Biological Technician

<http://www.ncsu.edu/project/grsmgis/AMOY/2009WG/Mcgee%202009%20AMOY%20Working%20Group%20Presentation.pdf> Predator Impact on

PIPL United States Fish and Wildlife Service Piping Plover Recovery Plan 1996, Reasons for Listing and Continuing Threats

<http://www.fws.gov/northeast/pipingplover/recplan/threats.html>

Specific Comments

iv Objectives Section, Visitor use and Experience: Comment: there should be a specific objective to ensure ORV usage to provide access to the park for visitors

vi: State-Listed and Special Status Species: Reasons for Analysis is noted as ORV "may have impact". Comment: Drastic measures should not be taken for "May Have impact", this is not backed by science

xii: Seasonal night-driving restrictions ?one hour after sunset until after turtle patrol has checked the beaches in the morning?... Comment: sunset to sunup closure is too restrictive and closes the beach during a prime usage time of spring, summer, and early fall. This is more restrictive than other seashores. No data exists to show that night driving has an impact on turtles.

Page 8: Long term Piping Plover target of 30 breeding pairs from 1996 study of USFWS. Comment: Since the available data of 1992 there have never been more than 21 nests. This is a 14 year old study. Setting a long term goal on a 14 year old study is not fair. Too much has changed and it set unrealistic goals that can never be met. This is only laying the ground for more restrictions on activities to achieve an unreachable goal

Page 67 B : Delineates the habitat that will be posted or fenced prior to April 1 to assure a high probability that territorial plovers will select protected areas in which to court and nest. Sites where nesting or courting plovers were observed during the last three seasons as well as other habitat deemed most likely to be pioneered by plovers should be included in the posted and/or fenced area. Comment: This is unacceptable as it closes beach based on past nesting not current. Closing beach that has been nested in the last 3 years will lead to massize beach closures.

Page 67: 1000 Meter vehicle free area on each side of a nest. Comment: What is the basis for 1000 meters? This creates 2000 Meters or 1.24 miles of closure for one nest. Does a chick(s) really need 1.24 miles of seclusion? Are there any facts for that, it seems grossly punitive for other users. With the goal of 15 nests, this could close 18.6 miles of beach every year. On page 73 your say?? Researchers reported that the minimum agitation distance to nesting piping plover was 50 meters, and suggested a buffer radius of 225 meters??yet the plan calls for 1000 meters" Recommend closures of 50M per nest and 200M for chicks.

P67 All closed sections should include a pass through corridor to provide access to open parts of the beach. Otherwise vast sections of the beach will be closed.

Page 71 (and 82 on option F): 6121. Prohibit nighttime driving on beaches during the loggerhead nesting season. Vehicles on the beach have the greatest potential to come into contact with nesting females and emerging hatchlings at night. In areas where beach driving is still allowed, nighttime vehicle use should be limited to essential vehicles (e.g., emergency or permitted research vehicles) only Comment: There have been no known or documented issues of an ORV hitting a turtle at night at CAHA. This is onerous and not impacting any nesting. Night fishing at the point and other areas in season is a traditional time to catch Red Drum and other fish. It is also an ideal way to star gaze away from light pollution.

Page 89: Give Special Consideration Only to Flora and Fauna Listed as Threatened and Endangered There is no logical rationale or data to justify protection of non-endangered species, no data to show this would have an impact. The ORV impact on wildlife assessment is a judgement call. Any activity, including hiking has some impact on wildlife. NPS allows a range of activities on park service land: roads, construction, forestry mining, etc that all impact wildlife in some way. ORV access has been present for years, there is no need to restrict if impact is not evident.

Page 94: Environmentally Preferred alternative. This proposal effectively eliminates ORV traffic from the beach. If the NPS is serious about maintaining access they can in no way support Alt d. Providing SMAs in known breeding/nesting areas throughout the Seashore, all under MLI management. Comment: The entire coast could be considered a known breeding/nesting area. This statement is a back door way to remove ORV access completely.

Page 94: A proactive way to protect large areas of the Seashore where protected species are known to breed and nest by prohibiting ORV use and pets in these areas year-round and only allowing pedestrian access outside of the breeding season. Comment: This is unacceptable and would eventually close the ENTIRE beach to ORV. Every time someone sees a protected species in breeding system that beach would be a "known breeding ground" for at least 3 years. With the wide range of protected species this would ultimately close almost all beaches to ORV and much of it to pedestrian.

Page 112: IN option F why is camping in the campgrounds limited to SCV?

Page 270 Chapter 3: SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES Page 270 ROI should not include the Towns and population North of Nags Head. This area is not in the National park and most of the tourists that go there rarely if every visit Hatteras Island due to the distance. These vacationers y are going for a commercial vacation experience and no changes to Hatteras Island will impact their decision to visit the northern towns.

If you include Duck, 2 hours 48 minute from Ocracoke, you should also include SwanQuarter which is in Hyde County and at only 2 hours and 30 minutes from Ocracoke is closer than Duck. This is just as viable a population from proximity and use. Since Ocracoke is in Hyde County, and is a major tax base for Hyde county, any impact to Ocracoke will have a major impact to the Tax Revenue for Hyde County.

Other Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Recognition of Pea Island National Wildlife refuge for species and as an dedicated Pedestrian area. This refuge is surrounded by the park and is a defacto part of the park. The report includes village areas as part of the covered area they should use Pea Island. Does the park service measure or

monitor species in the Park?

Agree Permits are necessary for drives. Carrying Capacity is OK but should be reasonable. Add additional parking and ramps Pet Leash laws. OK
Speed limits and ORV requirements Do not allow ATVs Reasonable closures

Correspondence ID: 13280 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Allen, Melissa
Received: May,10,2010 20:50:20
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: 13281 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:50:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13282 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:50:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more

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

Correspondence ID: 13283 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:50:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13284 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:50:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13285 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 20:50:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: For eleven years, I have been self-employed in Frisco, one of the eight villages located within the boundaries of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Eleven years is a proper amount of time to see shopping trends and learn who my customer is.
I struggle to understand how the economic conclusions were made in the DEIS. While struggling through pages 270-281 and again in pages 561 forward, I don't know how Hatteras Island can be grouped with the northern beaches. Our visitation and accommodations are about 1/3 of the area north of the Oregon Inlet Bridge. This translates into less people to begin with.
It is a different type of customer, too. The tourist who plans their vacation to visit Roanoke Island, Fort Raleigh and the Wright Brother's Memorial is not the same visitor who enjoys the ruggedness that is Hatteras Island where people are actively surfing, kayaking, wind and kite surfing as well as fishing. The northern beaches do not have the wide open beaches like Hatteras and the beach access issue does not relate to them as it does to us. The fact that DEIS data was developed from using economic models that had Northern beaches lumped together with Hatteras and Ocracoke is bogus and lacks logic because we are completely different and have a totally different clientele.
In my opinion, I strongly feel that the economic impact to Hatteras businesses like mine has been seriously downplayed. No economic survey has been conducted here. I was unable to find in the DEIS where the addresses the serious economic impacts that will be felt by Hatteras and Ocracoke businesses. I feel that data from 2008-2009 should have been seriously considered as these were 2 seasons under the Consent Decree where most of the prime beach access were closed DURING THE HEIGHT OF TOURIST SEASON. Numbers from these 2 years would have spoken volumes as to the economic stress the stores, restaurants and lodging has endured as our customer find other spots to vacation.
I believe there is a balance where all interests can be protected. The people of Hatteras are good stewards of the seashore. I disagree that the people of these seashore villages are treated without respect which is what I get out of the DEIS

Correspondence ID: 13286 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Leigh, Alex
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events.

Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledged rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

Correspondence ID: 13287 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Elliott, Charles

Received: May,10,2010 20:53:59

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.

Charles Elliott

Correspondence ID: 13288 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The

proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledged rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closure rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledged rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

Correspondence ID: 13289 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Epping, Jessica A
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: As President of The Outer Banks Wedding Association, I disagree with the DEIS proposing limited and prohibited access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational area. Hatteras Island has become a top location in the world for destination beach weddings. People come from all over the world to get married on the beach here. They choose our beaches because they are clean and wide with natural seascapes and a large majority of the couples choose Hatteras Island because they can have their pet in the wedding. That is one of the aspects of our beautiful National Park that makes us so unique. Pedestrian access to the beach is vital to the continued popularity and positive economic impact that beach weddings have on our area. Being able to walk right out to the beach for a ceremony is attractive for many couples seeking a destination beach wedding. The majority of these weddings are essentially week long vacations with family, friends and wedding guests enjoying the beach, activities and local attractions, like the Cape Hatteras Lighthouse, Cape Point, and more. Weddings bring increased income to our local economy. Our association is comprised of over 200 wedding-related businesses catering to the increased popularity and demand for destination beach weddings. I urge you to consider all aspects of beach access and the potential negative harm that prohibiting and/or limiting access will have on the beach economy and wedding industry on the outer banks.

Correspondence ID: 13290 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Frey, John W
Received: May,10,2010 20:56:07
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: 13291 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Weil, Sarah
Received: May,10,2010 20:58:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please save our beaches for wildlife and human enjoyment. Driving on the beach is destructive and noisy.

Correspondence ID: 13292 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Klein Conklin, Jane A
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Date: May 10, 2010 To: National Park Service From: Jane Klein Conklin Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments
Our comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. ??
1) Page 201: We disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." Although pedestrians may have an impact on protected species and their nesting spots, this may be comparable with natural predators who naturally have an impact on animal nesting. Pedestrian incursions into protected areas may be due to insufficient publicity and education. Traditionally, the NPS has used small outdated and often barely legible signs. We feel that increased signage including reflective materials as well as additional NPS enforcement will be sufficient to dissuade or deter both pedestrians and ORV's from entering boundary areas.
2) Page xxiv: We disagree with the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?"
Preventing usage of large portions of beach will eliminate the purpose of having a national park for people to be able to come and enjoy it. It would severely impact the current economy for local businesses and beach rentals. Traditionally, the NPS has used small outdated and often barely legible signs. We feel improved signage with additional publicity in the area (such as posters in local shops similar to those warning of rip tides) would help educate the visiting public and minimize any impact to the natural splendor.
3) Page xix and page 23: We am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". We disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15. 4) Page 1: We agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors." ?However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc) 5) Page 53: We disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. This would also result in the vehicle traveling twice the distance on the beach. Instead of one round trip, the vehicle would also need to make a second round trip in order to retrieve the handicapped person(s). Furthermore, the driver of the vehicle would also become a pedestrian. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well. 6) Page 121 ? 127. We strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is extremely oversized and does not seem to be based upon peer reviewed science. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer and would be consistent with other managed areas across the Nation. We should be an allowance for pass-thru corridors which would provide for ORVs to travel past an area using breeding / nesting buffer distances allowing for access as well as resource protection. We believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to

reliable food source, not expanded. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV and/or pedestrian access denies the public access to these beaches which were established as National Parks for use by the people. It also prevents the same ORV's/pedestrians from enjoying these species and being able to study them. 7) Page 468: We disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access. 8) Page 124: We strongly disagree with the NPS providing for over protection of resource management versus the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledged rate, Piping Plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS. 9) We disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%. So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles. ??

10) We disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park. Don't forget to count all of the nests and birds living on top of the local grocery stores as well when you are counting too. These roofs offer wind protection, rainwater pools, and fewer predators than the dunes and have become a new nesting area for many birds. 11) Page 1: We do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues. Hatteras Island has a tight knit community of local residents that have modified their livelihoods over the last few generations. Many aren't making a living fishing anymore rather they are in the tourism business to help enable their countrymen and women the opportunity to enjoy the natural beaches and marshes that the Federal Government saw fit to establish as a National Park so that the people could enjoy it. That doesn't preclude them from continuing to maintain their easy going laid back demeanor and atmosphere. The serenity of the environment and access to the beaches is the center point of the local culture. It has defined many generations and how the local inhabitants interact with each other. The people of Hatteras Island are well aware of how lucky they are. They cherish and protect the environment. To deny access to the beaches also denies them of their past, present and future.

Currently the culture as well as the economic stability of Hatteras Island is based on Tourism which has felt a significant impact by the current decline in the national economic downturn. Any additional decline of revenues felt by a decrease in visitors to the NPS due to lack of access may force widespread foreclosures and bankruptcies which are already at an all time high.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: We strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages ? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts. ? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI. On page xviii, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. We strongly disagree with this statement. We believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended. Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial. Added to the current economic recession this would exponentially multiply the dire financial issues plaguing the seashore village communities as well as force property values to plummet yet again. Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts. Many of the properties located on Hatteras Island are rental properties. As such, We feel that they too should be considered small businesses. Corporations or LLC entities own many rental properties, while individuals own the others. What they all have in common is that they rely on rental income to continue their operation. If the number of visitors to Hatteras Island is reduced, the ability of the owners to continue to pay the costs associated with running their business will be placed at risk. This could result in further impact to local businesses that rely on the performance of contract work on these properties. Furthermore, these owners may be forced out-of-business. In this case, the property may end up in foreclosure, which would expand the economic impact beyond the local area. In turn, this would result in lower property values for other houses in the area.

We own three properties on Hatteras Island and have been already severely impacted by the previous bans on usage. Our property values have declined so much that we have lost all our equity and then some. Our rental numbers have decreased to the point that if we lose any additional rentals we'll be in danger of losing everything which has already happened to many owners and investors in the community. Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible. Economic issues in the country have already caused vacation travel to decrease and stressed almost all of the island business. Beach closures have also pushed numbers lower and plagued the entire industry yet again. This would result in fewer visitors to an area which is highly dependent on tourism would be devastating with widespread financial disaster. 13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out. Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed. Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS. 14) Page 136: We strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31. Hatteras Island is a family vacation destination. As such, many vacationers bring an important part of their family, their dog. Due to the high cost of care for a dog while the owners are away, would be vacationers may be forced to remain at home. It seems to me that limiting the dogs to a 6 foot leash during the proposed timeframe to ban dogs would have the desired results. 15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. We disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. We think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas. The Cape

Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection. 16) Pages 97- 101. We strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As far as we know there are no proposed new access roads or parking areas planned. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years. 17) Page 104: We disagree with the proposed nighttime driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. We propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area. Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates. 18) Page 121: We disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors, artists, and those that want to access the beaches in these areas. Conclusion: Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed. It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date. We understand that there is legal pressure by highly funded activist groups. We respect nature, and would like to help preserve species, yet we understand that over time evolution happens. Our lives are changed as society evolves, just like animals have their own evolution. Birds are finding safe havens on the roofs of grocery stores instead of trees and dunes! It happens as they adopt to the changing world.

The NPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. We could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit." Thank you, Respectfully, Jane Klein Conklin Hamilton Square, NJ

Correspondence ID: 13293 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 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 wonderful resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many 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 won't work to preserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13294 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 21:05:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments on the proposed DEIS for Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area:

I've been vacationing with my family on Cape Hatteras for over 10 years enjoying all that the island has to offer, from fishing to enjoying all the wildlife native to the islands. I hope to be able to continue this tradition for many years, but I feel the Consent Decree and Alternative F are far too restrictive to beach access. I believe a more balanced approach between access and wildlife preservation needs to be worked out. For example:
 Buffer Sizes - I can't understand why a nest of birds would require nearly 800 acres of closure (1000m radius for the piping plover).
 Corridors - I feel that corridors play a vital role in providing access to both pedestrians and ORVs alike and need to be included in the final plan for all areas of the seashore all year long.
 Non-Endangered Species - I fail to understand the logic behind giving birds not listed as endangered the same level of protection given to endangered species. I also believe that all of the birds that nest on the dredge and spoil islands should be counted.
 To Summarize - I do not feel the proposed DEIS strikes the necessary balance between access and resource protection. I fear that economic and cultural losses as a result of an overly-restrictive plan will be far more substantial than is necessary.

Correspondence ID: 13295 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 21:06:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

- 1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
- 2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
- 3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and

Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide

line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

Correspondence ID: 13296 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 21:07:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area was created to be what it's name implies: a recreational area. My family has been vacationing at the Outer Banks since the early 1970s. We respect nature and treat it with care. Closing much of the beach to even pedestrian traffic prevents us from enjoying our favorite beach activities: walking and surf fishing. I can't imagine how a person walking along the water's edge could cause harm to nesting birds. I dream of my hour long beach walks throughout the year. They certainly are less enjoyable when I must repeatedly turn around and tread over the same sand. It is ridiculous to be so limited when there is so much shoreline. Similarly, driving on the beach is our primary method of access for surf fishing. Without the ability to drive on the beach, some of our family members (elderly and children) would not be able to fish due to the long walks required. Great lengths are being taken to protect birds that are not even endangered species. The cost of this extensive "protection" is a reduction in vacationers' enjoyment of the beach which has a direct impact on the local economy. Please reduce the restrictions in human beach access on Hatteras Island so that we can continue to enjoy our favorite place on Earth and support local businesses.

Correspondence ID: 13297 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 21:07:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation. Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13298 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: trauger, timothy n
Received: May,10,2010 21:08:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.
4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors." However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)
5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.
6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other

side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park. Interesting that man is credited with endangering wildlife, yet not given to creating these safe islands where they flourish!

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

As a relatively new home owner on Hatteras Island, I have quickly come to realize the tight bond of the local residents and their appreciation of tradition. I come to the island frequently and will feel the pain of these restrictions, I can't imagine lifelong residents that have had the ability to freely use and co-mingle with the natural resources, that all their steep traditions will quickly be snuffed out due to irrational decisions.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlviii, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

As a vacation home homeowner that allows guest to bring their pets, this is very disturbing. Approximately 40% of my rental weeks are those with guests that bring their pets. I too love to bring our family dog to the beach. And as a responsible pet owner we never allow our dog to run free. As many of the times I visited I did not see anyone having pets unleashed. Prohibiting pets would be a significant hardship to my family. Data shows that families that take their pets on vacation treat them as part of the family and do not allow them to be undisciplined. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs. 15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve

nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas. If pedestrians are prohibited access to the beach, what is the purpose of preserving the land for the enjoyment of future generations. If "bad apples" disobey, disciplinary action should be taken, but to deny enjoyment for the rest is against the founding principles of the USPS.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 13299 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Frame, Laura
Received: May,10,2010 21:09:10
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 ORV use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13300 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Date: May 10, 2010 To: National Park Service From: David Conklin Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments

Our comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. ??

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." Although pedestrians may have an impact on protected species and their nesting spots, this may be comparable with natural predators who naturally have an impact on animal nesting. Pedestrian incursions into protected areas may due to insufficient publicity and education. Traditionally, the NPS has used small outdated and often barely legible signs. I feel that increased signage including reflective materials as well as additional NPS enforcement will be sufficient to dissuade or deter both pedestrians and ORV's from entering boundary areas.

2) Page xxiv: I disagree with the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?"

Preventing usage of large portions of beach will eliminate the purpose of having a national park for people to be able to come and enjoy it. It would severely impact the current economy for local businesses and beach rentals. Traditionally, the NPS has used small outdated and often barely legible signs. I feel improved signage with additional publicity in the area (such as posters in local shops similar to those warning of rip tides) would help educate the visiting public and minimize any impact to the natural splendor.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15. 4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors." ?However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc) 5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. This would also result in the vehicle traveling twice the distance on the beach. Instead of one round trip, the

vehicle would also need to make a second round trip in order to retrieve the handicapped person(s). Furthermore, the driver of the vehicle would also become a pedestrian. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well. 6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is extremely oversized and does not seem to be based upon peer reviewed science. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer and would be consistent with other managed areas across the Nation. I should be an allowance for pass-thru corridors which would provide for ORVs to travel past an area using breeding / nesting buffer distances allowing for access as well as resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV and/or pedestrian access denies the public access to these beaches which were established as National Parks for use by the people. It also prevents the same ORVs/pedestrians from enjoying these species and being able to study them. 7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access. 8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS providing for over protection of resource management versus the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping Plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS. 9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%, So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles. ??

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park. Don't forget to count all of the nests and birds living on top of the local grocery stores as well when you are counting too. These roofs offer wind protection, rainwater pools, and fewer predators than the dunes and have become a new nesting area for many birds. 11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues. Hatteras Island has a tight knit community of local residents that have modified their livelihoods over the last few generations. Many aren't making a living fishing anymore rather they are in the tourism business to help enable their countrymen and women the opportunity to enjoy the natural beaches and marshes that the Federal Government saw fit to establish as a National Park so that the people could enjoy it. That doesn't preclude them from continuing to maintain their easy going laid back demeanor and atmosphere. The serenity of the environment and access to the beaches is the center point of the local culture. It has defined many generations and how the local inhabitants interact with each other. The people of Hatteras Island are well aware of how lucky they are. They cherish and protect the environment. To deny access to the beaches also denies them of their past, present and future. Currently the culture as well as the economic stability of Hatteras Island is based on Tourism which has felt a significant impact by the current decline in the national economic downturn. Any additional decline of revenues felt by a decrease in visitors to the NPS due to lack of access may force widespread foreclosures and bankruptcies which are already at an all time high.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages ? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts. ? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI. On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement. I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that have not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended. Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial. Added to the current economic recession this would exponentially multiply the dire financial issues plaguing the seashore village communities as well as force property values to plummet yet again. Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts. Many of the properties located on Hatteras Island are rental properties. As such, I feel that they too should be considered small businesses. Corporations or LLC entities own many rental properties, while individuals own the others. What they all have in common is that they rely on rental income to continue their operation. If the number of visitors to Hatters Island is reduced, the ability of the owners to continue to pay the costs associated with running their business will be placed at risk. This could result in further impact to local businesses that rely on the performance of contract work on these properties. Furthermore, these owners may be forced out-of-business. In this case, the property may end up in foreclosure, which would expand the economic impact beyond the local area. In turn, this would result in lower property values for other houses in the area.

I own three properties on Hatteras Island and have been already severely impacted by the previous bans on usage. Our property values have declined so much that we have lost all our equity and then some. Our rental numbers have decreased to the point that if we lose any additional rentals we'll be in danger of losing everything which has already happened to many owners and investors in the community. Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible. Economic issues in the country have already caused vacation travel to decrease and stressed almost all of the island business. Beach closures have also pushed numbers lower and plagued the entire industry yet again. This would result in fewer visitors to an area which is highly dependent on tourism would be devastating with widespread financial disaster. 13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out. Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed. Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen

as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS. 14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 -July 31. Hatteras Island is a family vacation destination. As such, many vacationers bring an important part of their family, their dog. Due to the high cost of care for a dog while the owners are away, would be vacationers may be forced to remain at home. It seems to me that limiting the dogs to a 6 foot leash during the proposed timeframe to ban dogs would have the desired results. 15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection. 16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As far as we know there are no proposed new access roads or parking areas planned. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years. 17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed nighttime driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 - September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area. Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates. 18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors, artists, and those that want to access the beaches in these areas. Conclusion: Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed. It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date. I understand that there is legal pressure by highly funded activist groups. I respect nature, and would like to help preserve species, yet we understand that over time evolution happens. Our lives are changed as society evolves, just like animals have their own evolution. Birds are finding safe havens on the roofs of grocery stores instead of trees and dunes! It happens as they adopt to the changing world. The NPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit." Thank you, Respectfully, David Conklin Hamilton Square, NJ

Correspondence ID: 13301 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 21:10:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly disagree with the statement on page vi that reads "visitor experience could be affected by conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreation uses." I am an avid windsurfer and have been on the beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area for 20 years. I have lived here for 13 of those 20 years. Through the years, I have spent has many as 150 days a year on the beaches. Yes, I like to keep a log of how many days I windsurf a year. I have never witnessed or heard of the type of conflict described on page vi. Has the NPS made these incidents public? When I researched this, there has been only one minor incident and the driver was not blamed or ticketed in the incident. No piping plover deaths have ever been attributed to trucks on the beach. Why would the DEIS make such a flawed assumption as found on page vi?

Correspondence ID: 13302 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 21:11:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please take a hard look at the damage ORV do to our beaches. Even in our parks ORV do a lot of damage to the ground and the drivers to these vehicles, in many cases, do not seem to care. It's a good reason many parks do not allow them. Our beaches are precious as are the critters that rely on them to survive. Please help protect them. Thank you for your time and attention to this very important topic. Sincerely, F. "Sam" Burnette

Correspondence ID: 13303 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 21:11:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.
4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors." However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)
5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or

her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access. 7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

Correspondence ID:	13304	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Vollmer, William W				
Received:	May,10,2010 21:12:53				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>I have been visiting Cape Hatteras National Seashore since the 1970's. I keep a travel trailer on a campsite in Buxton year round. I enjoy the freedom of driving on the beach and I love to surf fish. It is sad for me to see the negative impact of the beach closures on the local businesses.</p> <p>I disagree with the economic analysis presented. I do not feel it focused on the villages whose economies are most closely tied to the affected beaches, such as Buxton, Frisco, and Hatteras. Areas such as Duck and Southern Shores should not be included in the analysis.</p> <p>I don't agree with not allowing pass-through access corridors. I think properly managed corridors should be allowed at all times. There is no evidence that a corridor in the tide zone is detrimental to nesting birds.</p> <p>I do not think that the proper scientific studies were performed to back up the large buffers that are in the proposed plan. Also, I do not agree with not considering the populations of birds that inhabit the islands made from dredging in the study.</p> <p>I did not see any evidence-based science presented that indicated the impact of the plan on the nest survival would be significant. I have read the Piping Plover reports for the past few years and the impact of predators, storms, and ghost crabs on nest survival was much higher than the impact of humans. I disagree with closing beaches to ORVs and pedestrians without strong evidence-based peer-reviewed science to back up the decisions.</p> <p>I have lived in Florida and there are many turtle nests on the Florida beaches. They are marked and sometimes moved to protect them, but they do not close large areas of beach because of the turtle nests. I do not agree with closing the beaches and restricting night driving because of the turtle nests. I think a better management plan would be the use of a volunteer night watch program (I know there are programs like this on other North Carolina beaches such as Holden Beach) and nest relocation. There is evidence that these programs work.</p> <p>I do not understand why the National Park Service is killing off some species to protect others. I do not agree with the predator management program and think if one species is to be protected they should all be protected.</p> <p>I don't see any substantiated evidence presented that shows that the way the park was managed before the lawsuit was inadequate to protect the wildlife and natural resources. I think the energy put into restricting visitor access to this beautiful National Park that is paid for by my tax dollars would be better used if put towards an education program. I see no reason why we cannot enjoy the beaches and protect the wildlife. These are not mutually exclusive activities. I do not feel that the recommended alternative F protects my rights to enjoy the land set aside as a recreational area.</p>				
Correspondence ID:	13305	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Gray, Robin				
Received:	May,10,2010 21:13:42				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>I live here. My family and friends live here. I like the piping plover enough to provide reasonable respect to its well-being. However, I like this island and my job and our school and our beach. I like the people who come here and share just a little of our time and keep our island financially vital. There is PLENTY of sand and water here on Hatteras Island to EASILY accomodate both birds and the people who live, thrive, and NEED this place. PLEASE consider letting the people live here, too.</p>				
Correspondence ID:	13306	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	McPherran, Tina L				
Received:	May,10,2010 21:14:05				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>I agree with the statements in support of Beach Access made by Senator Basnight & Representative Spear in the letter they have submitted to you. Please do everything possible to preserve public access to the beaches. I have been going to Hatteras on family trips since I was an infant and have raised my son to do the same! We have spent countless hours-day and night fishing on the beach, camping at Cape Woods and the federal campground near the Cape Hatteras Lighthouse, swimming, fishing, shell collecting, star-gazing. Since the closures began a few years ago-our trips to Hatteras have greatly decreased. It seems all of the best fishing areas are the ones roped off and or closed at the point and Hatteras Inlet. Please keep the beaches open for everyone to enjoy! Tina McPherran</p>				
Correspondence ID:	13307	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Epping, Marylin				
Received:	May,10,2010 21:16:50				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>I am both a full-time resident of Hatteras Island and also the owner of three vacation rental properties on the island. I substitute teach at Cape Hatteras Secondary School of Coastal Studies. I have learned through the years that the beach and access to the ocean and sound are a vital part of life for island residents and tourists. Please note that the school is even titled "School of Coastal Studies". On any given day you can see how limited beach access is to our residents and tourists by the number of cars parked up and down HY 12 of people attempting to access the water. Can you imagine how many cars will line Highway 12 and the various oceanfront housing additions if beach access is limited even further? My daughter was recently involved in a costly accident when one of those cars did a u-turn directly into her vehicle on her way to work. People are concerned with the safety of vehicles on the beach when we already have a safety problem on HY 12 which will only be exacerbated if beach access is even more limited. Please remember that not every resident is fortunate enough to own waterfront property but every resident lives here because they love this area and want to enjoy the same water that tourists come here to enjoy. Access to the beach and sound are vital to the continuation of our tourist industry, the safety of our residents and the future of our children. There are very limited activities for the youth of our island. If you limit their access to the beaches even further what alternatives are there for them to stay out of trouble and to stay on this island. I too care about the welfare of the birds and turtles as all islanders care about the health of our island and wildlife but we have to put people first. PLEASE consider the safety and well being of the majority of residents and tourists.</p>				
Correspondence ID:	13308	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	N/A, N/A				
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. This approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative 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</p>				

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13309 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 21:20:40
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: 13310 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 21:20:40
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: 13311 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
In fact, I'd rather see no vehicles at all on the beach. It's dangerous for people, wildlife and the landscape equally. Someone was killed here in Florida,

hit by a vehicle on the beach. You've got little children, families, old people. Driving on the beach is a ridiculous idea and if people want to drive vehicles of any kind they can use a road. That's what they are there for. I don't like the idea of vehicles destroying national seashores. Even walking on dunes is a disturbance. Dunes and seashores are fragile environments that are easily disturbed and degraded. The more you let this environment be degraded, the less national seashore you end up with. You'll have less and less what with global warming and rising seas, which is not a myth.

* Put Natural Resources First. I am an Audubon member, so MY FIRST PRIORITY IS PROTECTION OF THE CREATURES, BIRDS, SEA TURTLES, ETC. If humans want to go around driving and ripping up the landscape, let them do it on private property, not in my national seashore. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13312 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 21:20:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13313 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Schmidt, Dennis P
Received: May,10,2010 21:23:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: DEIS
I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service's Alternative F for several reasons. First, the requirement that corridors are only allowed in ML-2 portions of SMA's and are subject to resource closures at any time are not reasonable (Pages xii, xviii, and 468) Such corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open area that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMA's. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairing or damaging protected resources!
Second, the NPS' buffers are larger than required by species recovery plans. For example, Piping Plover unfledged chicks, are given a protective buffer of a minimum of 1,000 meters in all directions. Buffers are an important management practice for species recovery. (Pages 121-127) However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife as well as the public which uses the beaches for recreation purposes, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000 meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres and is excessive above and beyond the additional benefits it might provide over a 200 meter buffer. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & reasonable buffer would be 200 meters
Third, non-endangered species, such as American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds are granted pre-nesting closures and buffers up to 300 meters. (Pages 121-127) However, birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the same level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300 meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted, including all of the birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.
Finally, DEIS claims North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission turtle guidelines will be followed. (Pages 125, 392-396) As an alternative, the NPS on Hatteras Island should utilize turtle management practices successfully used by the NPS on Padre Island as well as other areas. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas. Moreover, the Park Service could dig up and relocate unhatched turtle eggs to the state aquarium at Manteo, incubate the eggs in a protected environment, and then release the hatchlings on a predetermined day. The result would be far more effective in protecting/increasing the turtle population while simultaneously fostering good-will and support of both the community as well as the multitude of tourists who annually visit the Cape Hatteras National Recreation Area. Below attached is a description of the relocation and release program used at Padre Island National Seashore to increase the turtle population: "Sea Turtle Hatchling Releases"
"Eggs from most sea turtle nests found at Padre Island National Seashore and northward along the Texas coast are transported to the Padre Island National Seashore incubation facility for protected care and monitoring and the hatchlings are released at the northern end of Padre Island National Seashore. However, eggs from some of the nests found at the southern end of Padre Island National Seashore are incubated in a screen enclosure called a corral, located at the base camp near the National Seashore's 40 mile marker, and the resulting hatchlings are released there. Eggs from nests found on South Padre Island and Boca Chica Beach are transported to a corral on South Padre Island and hatchlings emerging from those nests are released on South Padre Island. Hatchlings from the incubation facility and corrals are released after they enter an active state called a frenzy which occurs about 1-

3 days after the slow process of hatching is first detected. Hatchlings are guarded during release to ensure that they safely enter the surf. A few nests are not found on the Texas coast at egg laying and thus incubate at the nest site (in situ). Since these nests are not protected, they typically have a lower survival rate than protected nests. Public Hatchling Releases at Padre Island National Seashore Each year, the public is invited to attend 15-25 of the releases of hatchlings that emerge from eggs cared for at the Padre Island National Seashore incubation facility. These releases are open to the public free-of-charge and are held at the northern end of the National Seashore, starting at about 6:30-6:45 am. Hatchling releases are extremely popular with the public. Thousands of people attend each year. Local citizens attend in large numbers, as do visitors from out of town."

Since this program has been proven to be successfully implemented on Padre Island for years, why has it not been considered as a viable alternative on Hatteras Island? For all of the above cited reasons, it appears that Alternative F is more punitive than protective. I strongly urge the National Park Service to reconsider its current position and instead support Alternative A. Until Judge Boyle's Decree, the rules that were observed by the NPS and the public resulted in a balance of protecting both wildlife and the environment while also affording humans the opportunity to enjoy the resources of Hatteras Island. In the time since the imposition of the Decree, the positive impact on the piping plover and sea turtle populations has been negligible when weighed against the stringent rules and restrictions on beach utilization imposed on the human population.

Correspondence ID: 13314 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Moore, Bob
Received: May,10,2010 21:34:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is outrageous to even consider allowing offroad vehicles on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. This area belongs to the wildlife and the public.

Correspondence ID: 13315 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gamache, Stephanie R
Received: May,10,2010 21:42:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I grew up going to Myrtle Beach every summer. We camped at Lake Arrowhead and loved it. As it became more of a tourist town, I stopped going. I then tried Daytona Beach and was shocked that cars were allowed on the beaches. What an awful experience. I then tried Hilton Head and really enjoyed it. I have also been to Cape Hatteras and enjoyed that beach as well. The bottom line: we need to have places where we can relax and enjoy nature, not worry about being run down by an ORV or car. I never went back to Daytona and would not return to Cape Hatteras if it was turned over to ORV's.

Correspondence ID: 13316 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Roland, Jon R
Received: May,10,2010 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 would also like to mention that as an avid ORV user myself here in Kentucky, I can first hand tell you about the extreme damage capable of being caused by irresponsible off-rovers. There are certain areas of the Daniel Boone National Forest here in Kentucky that are setup and designated for ORV use and travel. While these "trails" offer spectacular scenery and views not readily available to most, there are some people who do not see it as such. Every year more and more new and unauthorized trails are being created by ORV users that cause irreputable damage to our forestry. Knowing and seeing how such damage can be caused very quickly I fear that if ORV use is allowed free roam year round at Cape Hatteras there will be devastating damage caused. While I'm not against ORV use entirely, I feel that it should be limited and restricted to certain times and 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.
Jon Roland www.SaveOurCave.org KyNaturalistJ@aol.com

Correspondence ID: 13317 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Evans, Paul
Received: May,10,2010 21:43:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Figure 1 submitted by Dave Wilson with his comments during the public hearing in Buxton, NC on April 26, 2010 shows the relationship between the number of Piping Plovers found on the Outer Banks and the named storms that have struck the Outer Banks from 1987 to 2009. The Piping Plover population began to decline in 1996. That same year the first named storms struck the Outer Banks in over a decade. Named storms made regular landfall on the Outer Banks for more than a decade after 1996. This evidence clearly indicates that storms, not off-road vehicles, have been the cause of the decline in the Piping Plover population. Because storms and not vehicles caused the decline in the bird population the "environmental impact" of any one of the proposed off-road vehicle management plans will be negligible. Placing broad new restrictions on the use of off-road vehicles on Hatteras Island is not going to cause the Piping Plover population to increase above its current level.
The "environmental impact" of any one of the proposed plans on the Hatteras Island economy will be devastating. Fishing and beach access are the two main reasons that most tourists visit Hatteras Island.
The final off-road vehicle plan adopted by the National Park Service should not restrict access to the beach any more than beach access was restricted during the decade from 1987 to 1996, when the Piping Plover population was at its normal historical level (see American Birds magazine, March 1980, volume 34, number 2, page 207) and co-existing with off-road vehicles.

Correspondence ID: 13318 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 21:44:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My wife and I enjoy traveling the US in out RV. We are especially drawn to areas where we can enjoy our ATV.

I regards to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.

Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources.

Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.

Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.

The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13319 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 21:50:40

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: 13320 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, N/A

Received: May,10,2010 21:51:58

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have saved my enire adult life to be able to buy a 4 wheel dive vehicle just so i can tavel from vA to the OBX. I purchased this truck in 2005 and was so happy that i could show this way of life to my chilren as my father did me. Since then as a family we make that trip almost every weekend that the weather is nice.Sometimes we make a day trip and sometimes we camp. Closing the beaches is killing a very special way of life and hurting the economy. It has already been a real hardship on us because after traveling for three hours we are not even sure where we can get on the beach and even if we will be able to get on the beach. I never understood why we needed to close the beaches for the birds and turtles because the whole time we have been going to the beach access at Oregan Inlet there has always been closed sections to preserve these nesting grounds so I don't understand why suddenly we have to close the beaches to do the same thing. And it appears to me that the only beaches that are being closed are the most popular and the ones that draw the most people. This seems more like a punishmet to me than anything.What are we being punished for? Teaching our children to respect the land and enjoy the beauty that has been given them?

Correspondence ID: 13321 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 21:55:55

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have been going to the OBX for more than 20yrs. I wish to continue to travel to the region for recreational activities. I rent a house, buy food and shop in the area. My children have been there and hopefully their children will have that opportunity as well. Make the right decision to allow all parties to be satisfied to use this fantastic area!

Correspondence ID: 13322 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Kunz, James E

Received: May,10,2010 21:56:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Cape Hatteras National Seashore is critical to the native plants and animals and to the Homo Sapiens who observe the flora and fauna and appreciate the native inhabitants. Please keep the Seashore as unfettered as possible, and by all means, keep all motorized vehicles away from this unique environment.

Correspondence ID: 13323 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Wright, Nathan S

Received: May,10,2010 21:57:59

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Although I am not a resident of the Outer Banks, I visit the CHNSRA a minimum of 25-30 days a year. After reviewing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, I was confounded by the fact that only 2 paragraphs of the 810 page document addressed the preservation of cultural practices specific to the CHNSRA, i.e. surf fishing for red drum, which happens to be the reason that I choose to visit. I feel that this minute level of explanation underscores my opinion that the National Park Service has undergone a paradigm shift from a position of managing the balance of species conservation vs. access maximization to an elitist position of doling out only bread crumbs of access to OUR national seashore. I think that the last 3 to 5 years has produced an adversarial relationship between the park service and residents/frequent users of the seashore. I wonder if this may be the reason that so little of the DEIS pertained to cultural preservation. With this in mind, please consider the following point.

1. I feel that the restrictions on night time driving are excessive. I feel that you are wasting users, such as myself, as a resource. I spend the entire night on the beach, specifically the beaches of Ocracoke, for a minimum of 30 DAYS A YEAR. I am a responsible ORV user. I follow the rules. I love the dynamics that change and shape the CHNSRA. I would love to take an annual class and be certified on how to recognize and report turtle nesting or bird breeding behavior in order to have more vehicular access to the beach at night. I would love to participate in species management. I would pay several hundred dollars for a permit in addition to having to participate in a training course in order to have more access (specifically night time access). By using the proposed night time driving restrictions laid out in the DEIS, you put me on the sidelines and waste a valuable resource. I have read the data on ORV related turtle loss, and I'm sure that the NPS has also. I know that every turtle egg counts, but why waste a valuable resource for data collection and policing the beach at night when the park service has only limited patrols when so few incidents have occurred over the last 10 years? I guess the NPS feels that it is easier just to tell ORV users that we can't be there and ignore the negative economic impact.

2. I am disappointed in the lack of scientific evidence for the proposed buffer zones under the DEIS. I am especially infuriated by the extreme nature of the buffer zones and closure recommendations for non-endangered species. Where do these numbers come from? What evidence was used to obtain them? I am a clinical pharmacist and all of my medical decision making is based on the best scientific evidence available. If NPS is going to cause the complete economic collapse of OUR Outer Banks and end access to OUR national seashore, where is the smoking gun that necessitates these kinds of measures? Weather and predator related hardship on nesting birds overwhelmingly represents the cause of loss of most nesting birds. I have read the data. Once again, I guess it is easier just to have the elitist mindset that ORV users will just have to take what they can get and tell ORV users that we can't be on the seashore, instead of implementing measures such as travel corridors, for example. As an ORV user, I am willing to participate in training courses or purchase permits to be able to navigate sensitive areas, but I guess NPS isn't even interested in having me involved.

Please stop wasting me as a caring steward of the CHNSRA. Please continue to give me a chance to show how much I love the island of Ocracoke and the greater Outer Banks. Please remember that not all surf fishermen are hot heads from Buxton. Responsible access is not a crime.

Correspondence ID: 13324 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Girard, John P
Received: May,10,2010 22:09:12

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My comment, one point of view: The National Park Service preserves unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the national park system for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations. The Park Service cooperates with partners to extend the benefits of natural and cultural resource conservation and outdoor recreation throughout this country and the world. Future generations, so that my children and their children can enjoy the same experiences that I have enjoyed, as following the schools of fish up and down the beach in my vehicle, trying to capture that special moment on camera or rod and reel. There is much joy watching the expressions on a handicap friend who for the first time is able to cast into the surf and catch a big bluefish at the Point where the currents meet creating a spectacular view. There is much beauty walking barefoot in the sand, during the day or on a moonlight night, enjoying your surroundings, watching the wildlife, waves and the minute by minute changes of water and sand. The experience of assisting the commercial fishermen who working there nets and make their living on our water and beaches, or the listening of an Interpreter explaining to my child, the hatching of a turtle as it crawls from the depths of the sand. There was a day when you could cross the Bonner Bridge, make a left, past the Oregon Inlet Coast Guard Station, drive through the campground and drive all the way to Buxton without passing but a few vehicles. Then, Fish and Wildlife, mandated to protect the wildlife, manage the Park Service Land, and close the area to vehicles, a haven for plovers and turtles, Pea Island it is. Today, most everyone owns a four wheel drive vehicle and many want the experience of driving on the beach and enjoying the environment as we have done. There is a definite need to properly manage vehicle use due to the number of visitors. I am in favor of a permit system that would manage the numbers as a compromise. I am in favor of keeping the beaches open year round for vehicles and public access day and night. I would be in favor of the document, "Coalition for Beach Access, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, ORV Access Environmental Impact Position Statement." I can say I have had the privilege to enjoy the open beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore for the majority of my lifetime. It is my hope, that my children and their children and future generations are able to share the same experiences.

Correspondence ID: 13325 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 22:09:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not know if CHNS actually has the option of exercising the "no-action" Alternative A, but I would like to voice support for properly institutionalizing the Interim Protected Species Management Strategy as the best Alternative of all those offered in the ORV EIS document. As a long-time visitor to CHNS, I have felt that the managers of CHNS were doing a good job of balancing species protection and recreational use of the beach prior to the lawsuit filed against CHNS by the Audobon Society & Defenders of Wildlife. The restrictions imposed by the Consent Decree and those in the CHNS preferred Alternative F are a draconian response to ORV management and are not supported by practical facts. For example, I see in the EIS that, for the Southeast Region, Piping Plover breeding pairs increased from 158 to 333 (more than doubled) from 1986 to 2008. That averages an increase of 8 pairs/yr. for the 22 year period. At that rate, the regional goal of 400 breeding pairs would be achieved in just 9 more years. That statistical trend does not suggest a failure of wildlife management or that Alternative F's extreme measures (such as the 1000 meter buffer areas, year-round ORV closure of False Point in Hatteras Inlet, etc.) are necessary. Moreover, the NCWRC has stated that NC listed "species of concern" should not be used as triggers for beach closures. The EIS acknowledges that the Cape Point and the spits at Oregon, Hatteras and Ocracoke inlets are the most preferred and productive places at CHNS for surf fishing; they are, in fact, among the most treasured public fishing places along the southeast coast and access to all of them is necessary to allow for a variety of fishing experiences under different wind and tidal conditions. A balance needs to be achieved between allowing reasonable recreational access to these places and the NPS's legitimate mission to preserve threatened species. Why should these valuable public recreational resources be so severely restricted when there are so many miles of public seashore that are completely closed to ORV use, such as at Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge (PINWR) and at the Core Banks? Unless there are specific scientific studies that show that that a particular species' existence is in jeopardy and that full beach closures like those at PINWR and the Core Banks are effective and necessary for achieving species survival, then a rational case for such restrictive measures at CHNS has not been made. I can certainly live with some compromises that are scientifically demonstrated to be necessary to protect the beach life we treasure. I am a scientist (but no biologist), so perhaps some reasonable limits on night-driving during turtle nesting season are an example. But the Preferred Alternative F is, overall, an unreasonable approach to ORV management and I do not support it. Since CHNS is required to prepare an ORV management plan, please style it as a more balanced approach, more like what CHNS was doing under the Interim Protected Species Management Strategy.
Respectfully submitted, Scott Nelson

Correspondence ID: 13326 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Grenoble, Sharon W
Received: May,10,2010 22:12:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am very concerned about the effects that the proposed beach restrictions would have on the beautiful Outer Banks of North Carolina. The negative economic impact due to fewer visitors and the loss of our ability to enjoy this wonderful national resource will be very significant.

I agree that the Piping Plovers should be protected, but think that the 1,000 meter closure around an unfledged chick brood is excessive and should be reduced to an area that is less restrictive to pedestrian and vehicle access while still providing a margin of safety for the nests. On the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service's website, the management practice for the Piping Plover in the New England area is to "Install a symbolic fence around plover courtship habitat and at least 50 meters from Plover nests. This will prevent disturbances to nesting adults, protect eggs and provide a safe place for newly hatched chicks".

I would like to suggest that the Park Service develop habitats on the island which are away from the prime fishing spots for breeding areas for the Piping Plover.

I agree that pets should be on 6-foot leashes when on the beach, but do not agree that pets should be banned completely from the beach. I would like to know the rationale for this proposal, as it does not seem like a dog that is being supervised on a 6-foot lease is a threat to the roped-off nesting areas of protected birds or turtles.

Thank you for your time and consideration to these comments on this very important subject.

Very Sincerely,
Richard Grenoble Sharon Grenoble

Correspondence ID: 13327 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 22:16:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly disagree with the proposal being supported by the NPS. I do believe that a proper economic impact study should be done focusing only on the towns most effected by the closures (Rodanthe, Waves, Salvo, Avon, Buxton, Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke). This will insure the numbers are not affected by including the northern beach towns. I am in favor of pets being allowed all year long. I am in favor of designating certain areas (cape point, hatteras inlet, north and south points of ocracoke, and bodie island spit) as primary fishing areas and therefore being allowed year round 24 hr. orv and pedestrian access to pursue our recreation. If a closure for an endangered bird is present, the use of an orv and pedestrian corridor should be provided to allow us to gain access to our prime spots. I am in favor of orv permits where the permit holder must have proper safety equipment.

Correspondence ID: 13328 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 22:17:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please remember that the public should not be "locked out" from our public resources. Common sense should allow access. The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation. Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources.

Correspondence ID: 13329 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Yanna, Jason A
Received: May,10,2010 22:19:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation. Vehicle and Pedestrian corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Within every open area, there has to be some restriction. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters. I would also like to add that birds, not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be say 30-50 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. Finally, the National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas. With cooperative efforts on both accounts of the National Park Service, and the users and visitors to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, man and nature can coexist with no problems. Also, with proper involvement of Land Use and OHV Groups, better education and information could be made more readily available to the users of this area. I would appreciate any and all comments, and welcome the chance of further communications with the National Park Service.

Correspondence ID: 13330 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Sink, Steve C
Received: May,10,2010 22:24:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments are short. I don't need 35,000 characters to say two things: [1] What right does any group have to take it upon themselves to change a culture that has functioned perfectly for 300 to 400 years? [2] Who in this God's world has the right, for any reason, to determine that for the comfort of one very small population of animals, that hundreds of other animals must be killed? What kind of deranged thinking must go on in the minds of these narcissistic, damnable ass-holes? I'm probably simply talking to myself, as, it is doubtful in our political machine that anyone will even read this or give a damn. Steve C. Sink, 1911 Clyde Fitzgerald Rd., Linwood, N.C. 27299 Cell phone 336-250-0710

Correspondence ID: 13331 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 22:34:36
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello my name is Greg and I live in Salvo, a village within Cape Hatteras National Park. I have a few comments concerning the Alternative F governing plan put forward by the NPS. I do not agree with the NPS view that visitor experience to the park could be affected by conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreation users. My research has shown to me that in a 10 year history, there has only been one minor incident involving a stuck vehicle and a pedestrian. The driver was not blamed by any parties involved, nor was he charged. I do not agree with NPS policy to refuse to acknowledge that Pea Island NWR is an excellent area for pedestrian only access. The beaches are often very close to the road. In other cases there are visible trails from the side of the road through the brush/grass to the beaches. These beaches are much easier to access, for pedestrians, than the beaches within the NPS, which often have no means of access other than the ramps(no trails) which are subject to closure to all traffic, pedestrian as well as ORV. I do not agree with the NPS view that even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk(from pedestrians and ORVs). I have have seen no data to show that any Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to civilian ORVs. I have been informed that 26 of 29 Piping Plover deaths have in fact been at the hands of government officials/volunteers. I do not agree with the NPS view that South-facing villages such as Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke should have a shorter Off-season, September 15 to May 15, than other areas. Seasonal visitor statistics are similar in all of the villages. I do agree with the opinion that ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors. The enforcement of pedestrian only accesses discriminates against many visitors. People with physical disabilities, elderly adults, groups with infant/young children, and groups with recreation equipment(surfboards, fishing gear or coolers with food or drinks). Many people who visit the seashore do it as an all day event and rely on their ORVs to transport these items, rather than the multiple 300-500 yard trips across the hot sand. It is also possible that the REMOVAL of ORV access will likely cause much more congestion at choke points such as parking lot areas. ORV access allows people to spread out and allow for less congested areas. I do not agree with the plans to move ramp 2 to 0.5 miles south of Coquina Beach. It is my opinion that this would be an exercise in financial irresponsibility. The money could be better spent to enlarge the parking lot and provide pedestrian and handicapped accessible ramps to the beach.

Correspondence ID: 13332 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: midgett, gilbert r
Received: May,10,2010 22:43:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: my greatgrandfather grandfather father myself my son and hopefully my grandson have driven on the beach between corolla and hatteras some made there living some fished but until we treat everybody the same on parkservice land its not a fair law or what ever is passed stop hang glidding on jockeys ridge stop kite boarding in hatteras stop boating in all national parks im sure that other indangered animals are in other parks but the government doesnt make the money on the beaches of the outer banks as larger national parks this is a lifetime thing to my family Ive been here for 50 yrs my hole life you people dont know about this beach live here a lifetime then tell me that a bird are a turtle only nest here or just where we drive its about northern millionars and there homes not the locals I MEAN REAL LOCALS NOT TRANSPLANTS I was here when a bombing range was in duck how many birds or turtles were killed then nobody said anything then when no houses were up north nobody cared about turtles Ive seen turtles on the beach since I WAS 5YRS OLD UP NORTH My uncles and grandfathers told stories of turtles down south and taking little ones turning them loose inthe ocean so guls didnt get them also u better pass a hunting season on the guls because they eat plover eggs your politics is about money well put the outerbank on unemployment and we will close the bridge from currituck so nobody drives on beach this will end the problem and turn the beach back like it was 50yrs ago before all u birdwatchers and turtle lovers were here and we can make a living the old way like our fathers before us keep your northern money and let us be A LOCAL MIDGETT FROM HOME

Correspondence ID: 13333 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,10,2010 22:44:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please see that Cape Hatterus National Park stays as pristine as you can possibly make it. Please do not allow off-road vehicle use there. Thank you, Barbara Bockman (a North Carolina native now living in Florida)

Correspondence ID: 13334 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 22:51:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
As native Floridian, I find the entire idea of motorized vehicles on the beach bizarre. I spent a good portion of my childhood on the beach in the Tampa/St. Petersburg area and the Ft. Myers area. There were no vehicles allowed on the beach, and all the beaches had plenty of people enjoying the sea. ORVs are not needed to enjoy a beach, and I think vehicles should be banned completely from the beach. I have visited Hatteras, and the entire time my sister and I were walking on the beach, trying to enjoy ourselves, we kept feeling as if we were about to be run over. ORV drivers seem to think they own the beach, and the beach belongs to all of us. Why do I have to feel unsafe so they can drive where vehicles really have no place being? Many residents of Hatteras claim that their economy is entirely dependent on people being able to drive on a beach. Has anyone ever studied how many more people would come to Hatteras if they did not feel like they were going to be run over while trying to enjoy the sand? How much do non-ORV users such as birders bring to the local economy?
The ORV use is also placing wildlife in danger. People, birds, turtles, and other wildlife are in constant danger due to ORV use. Animals can get out of the way of a pedestrian, but it is harder for them to get out of the way of a truck. Many of the animals that come to Hatteras are endangered. Since when can the Endangered Species Act be disregarded simply because someone wants to fish from a truck? The wildlife needs to be protected. The National Park Service needs to do its job and protect wildlife. National Parks are supposed to be places where people can enjoy nature and wildlife, not a place where gas guzzling machines destroy wildlife.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13335 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 22:51:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13336 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 22:51:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13337 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 22:51:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13338 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,10,2010 22:55:14

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it my concern,
DON'T LET OFF ROAD VEHICLES DOMINATE CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE!
Thanks,
Marisa

Correspondence ID: 13339 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Emerson, Scott P

Received: May,10,2010 22:55:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: National Park Service, and legislative members of the State of North Carolina, Federal Legislators, local business owners and the fine residents of Hatteras Island. As a Federal tax payer and a tax payer of the State of North Carolina(when Im visiting), I find it a sorrowful act that you want to cut off and close theses beaches where so many people call it home and one of the great vacation lands in these United States of America. Businesses are being closed, vacation homes not being rented, or lost, foreclosed on. The State of North Carolina will and or are losing state tax dollars because of these closings or acts of closure.. We need to find a happy medium between wildlife and human existence on our beaches and environmental areas . Keep buffers alive and nesting areas, closed, vegetation areas safe, but do not close it to the very people that live there, and visit and keep the economy alive and bring it back to prosperous times.. I was once a resident of Kitty Hawk, NC... One of the best experiences I have ever had. Living there was great, and enjoyable time. I have been visiting the Outer Banks since I was 7 years old.. From camping at the Federal Campground, in Salvo, years back to Oregon Inlet,Frisco, Buxton campgrounds.. My children come to this very day, and have grown up vacationing on Hatteras Island. I have surfed every spot on that Island, respected the beaches, trash pickup, Surfriders Foundation, Stayed at the Outer Banks Motel,rented homes from Beach Realty in Rodante, Foodlion Store in Avon, etc. My money spent on local businesses there, keeping the economy alive there as well. It will be a sad day if these beaches are closed to the American public they pay for the very land they want to live on , recreate on,and just plain ole visit.. It will become a vast open area. The people will move, businesses will come to a stand still, go under. Homes and people will vanish.. It will be a sad loss for everyone concerned.. Now I know how our Native Indians must have felt when being pushed from there lands and homes when the white man came to this country.. Hear us , and hear us NOW !!!! No to the closings of our beaches !! Let the public speak, hehar our CRIES !!!! As a tax payer, I pray that this will not happen and I pray for the residents of the State of North Carolina, and these people who love so dear these Outer Banks of Hatteras Island..A history of Ocean,land,wildlife,and hard working tax paying citizens of this country. God bless us all, Scott P. Emerson..Henrico , Va

Correspondence ID: 13340 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kilmer, Randy
Received: May,10,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 ORV's do not need beautiful wild beaches to ruin. There are plenty of areas that are ruined already. Say an old open pit mine. They do not know the difference.
 As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 Please adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement. ORV's do not belong on wild beaches. There are plenty of pits and old strip mines for them. They do not care wear they ride. They just want noise and excitement. It does not take a wild beach for that.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 13341 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 23:10:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not think off road vehicles belong in any of our national parks. thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13342 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,10,2010 23:20:47
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.
 My personal view is that NO PARK, BEACH or other precious area and its very important ANIMAL LIFE should be subjected to vehicles, least of all noisy ones. Special areas should be reserved for the natural inhabitants and humans who respect land and wildlife.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.

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

Correspondence ID:	13343	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 23:36:27						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	When I heard that the NPS was considering Off road Vehicles (ORV) for Cape Hatteras National Seashore I really was mystified that you would even consider the idea! My memory of my childhood trip with family there is still vivid to me and very precious. The National Seashore is a treasure and should be treated as such. Careful management of it should include access to pedestrians only and to management of the wildlife there , of which there are many: birds,mammals,plants and sealife of all kinds. Allowing Off road vehicles would without a doubt destroy any efforts in the management of wildlife and destroy the balance of the environment. I urge you to think only of how important it is to maintain the natural state of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It is your duty.						
Correspondence ID:	13344	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Van ripper, Daniel F						
Received:	May,10,2010 23:44:24						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I am a 20 year visitor and 14 year owner of property on hatterus island. I have reviewed the DEiS and I wish to express the position the NPS is suggesting will create economic hardship (to local business, rental property, decline in property values and a decline in property/business tax revenue). I fully support preservation of fragile environment and endangered species, but without a well thought out plan, no one will come to the area and provide the necessary effort and economic support to make a DEIS a success.This plan must balance resource management and the community welfare. I believe that free and open beaches can be maintained if pass through corridors be included in management buffers (reference page xii,xvii,and 468 of DEIS). Buffer zones (pg 121-127) should be set up for endangered birds/species identified by federal designation and be sized based on peer reviewed science. The 1000 yard buffer proposed is not supported by science and literature can support buffer zones that provide are much smaller and would benefit the endangered species and the community welfare. Successful turtle management practices (like nest relocation) in states like Florida are not fully incorporated in the DEIS (pg 125, 392-396). Non endangered birds/species should be valued but not be sited to have buffer zones that create restricted access to beaches. I hope that the NPS can identify that people need access to our wildlife resources to truly appreciate its value and be inclined in to make the investment needed to preserve the resourses. The outer banks community have been the leaders in preserving these resources over the years and they are fully aware that they can not survive if they abuse them. Please take the time to here their pleas and incorporate some input so that future generations will partake and want to preserve in vital resource. Thankyou, Daniel Van Ripper						
Correspondence ID:	13345	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 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. Over the last few nights my family and myself have been watching the special on all our National State Parks.How wonderful that a few special people saw the beauty that needed to be saved. I pray now, you change your mind and realize how having these off road vehicles will only destroy a much needed habitat for many different wildlife. Because of man, right now in our Gulf we may lose countless wildlife.Like the brown pelicans that nest's at the Bretons National Refuge,where as of Friday the oil spill had reached it's shore line. Then there's the sea turtles and laying their eggs, let's just say no to any off road recreational vehicles. Please keep Cape Hatteras National Seashore protected for the wildlife that so depends and needs it. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. Thank you for your time to read my letter.						
Correspondence ID:	13346	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,10,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points. 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that 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 has not been ORV use in any park that has not significantly harmed wilderness and wildlife, and in no park has ORV use stayed within designated areas. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and						

analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery 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.

Thank you, Marika Roberson

Correspondence ID: 13347 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:20:52
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13348 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:21:33
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: 13349 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Masem, Greg
Received: May,11,2010 00:30:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation. Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13350 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:59:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: May 11th, 2010
 Mariam Elsayed Student of the University of Missouri 2500 Old 63 Highway Apt. 1324 Columbia, MO 65201 Email: maewx7@mail.missouri.edu
 Re: Request for the suspension of ORV usage on Cape Hatteras National Seashore, Comments on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore DEIS.
 Dear Superintendent Murray,
 Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage off-road vehicle use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would allow for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. According to alternative D, visitors to the seashore would have the maximum amount of predictability regarding areas available for ORV use and vehicle-free areas for pedestrian use. Restrictions would be applied to larger areas over longer periods of time to minimize changes in designated ORV and non-ORV areas over the course of the year. Comparing this alternative to alternative A, which would involve no action, and few restrictions on ORV driving on beaches would have detrimental affects on the landscape and wildlife of this area.
 Below is a discussion of why alternative D would be more suitable for this landscape in regards to the landscape and wildlife, comparative to other alternatives, more specifically, alternative A.
 In the discussion of alternative A, harmful impacts of ORV usage may be long-term major in regards to piping plover and wildlife. Compared to the impacts of alternative D, which are long term negligible to minor, and may actually provide beneficial impacts to that of wildlife and the natural landscape. With regards to visitor use and experience, alternative A only provides long term negligible to minor impacts with the consideration of usage. Alternative D, as far as socioeconomic concerns, would create a greater likely-hood of beneficial adverse impacts for small business. Furthermore, it is long term beneficial, comparative to all other alternatives. With the collection of all of these impacts, alternative D would be more suitable for wildlife, landscape, visitors and small business owners.
 Other alternatives besides alternative A, would also not create the appropriate balance between the users of the seashore and its wildlife. Alternative B, is similar to that of alternative A, which implies no action, therefore further harming wildlife, and would have significant impacts on the landscape. Alternative C would have similar impacts as to that of alternative A and B, therefore not providing the adequate protection of the seashore. Alternative E, though proposed to have maximum management of the area would still allow for ORV usage, and is the most costly of all of the alternatives. With alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of seashore beach, which would create an unfair balance. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, alternative D's approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 Once again, thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore draft environmental impact statement. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balance final plan for all visitors that better protect protects the natural resources of the seashore.
 Sincerely, Mariam Elsayed 2500 Old 63 Highway Apt. 1324 Phone: (870)-926-9928 Email: maewx7@mail.missouri.edu

Correspondence ID: 13351 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Noone, Molly
Received: May,11,2010 01:16:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray, Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a beautiful place for families to come out to enjoy the beach and ocean. I believe that off road vehicals would be a bad idea for this area of beaches. The damages could last for years. I think you should consider the wildlife and vegetations that live there. Thank You.

Correspondence ID: 13352 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gaskins Jr., Lloyd E
Received: May,11,2010 01:27:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: In the limited time that I have had to read and try to understand the DEIS I have come to the conclusion that I am opposed to the Alternative F that the NPS prefers. The Species management areas are not warranted as are the 1.5 mile floating closures. These areas are designated for birds that are not entitled to federal protection under the Endangered Species act and it is not the intent of the State for them to have this extreme amount of protection. These areas will cause already congested areas to be more congested and thereby decrease the visitor experience. I am in favor of the proposed additional ramps and interduneal road with ocean access as proposed by the coalition for beach access. I would also support the buffer zones proposed by the coalition. These buffers would be flexible in nature and provide for food foraging for the bird and access for the visitor. The 5 year periodic review is inadequate. The shore of Cape Hatteras changes far to quickly for breeding areas and ORV routes to be reviewed only once every five years. An annual review would be the minimum time for review of the plan. Current closures under the consent decree have been a direct cause of the loss of human life. With no visitors on the beach in the areas of the spits, a safety factor for the commercial and recreational boaters has been removed. Problems seen by beachgoers are reported to the US Coast Guard and rescue efforts implemented within minutes instead of hours after the incident. The NPS needs to change the policy on protecting turtle nests. With over 40% of the nests being lost to over wash nests located in those areas should be moved above the flood line. This would protect the nest and allow access for the visitor. Cape Hatteras was established as a national recreational seashore. Service policies may change but the law has not. The proposed alternatives are not in favor of a Recreational Experience they are in favor of wildlife management. The beauty of Cape Hatteras by virtue of being federal land and not open for development will protect the natural landscape now lets protect the Recreational experience afford by the Island and our national park.

Correspondence ID: 13353 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Schraeder, Paul E
Received: May,11,2010 01:27:53
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: 13354 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Jones, Katherine J
Received: May,11,2010 01:54:37
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: 13355 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 02:32:35
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: 13356 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Mendieta, Vince
Received: May,11,2010 02:32:46
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: 13357 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 02:51:01

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: 13358 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Tsosie, David

Received: May,11,2010 03:17:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: No ATV on the beach,ever.

Correspondence ID: 13359 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, N/A

Received: May,11,2010 03:29:21

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have spent at least 10 summers in this area, all of them very memorable-dunes are very very fragile-please do not let a bunch of drunken, irresponsible humans destroy this beach forever and ever!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 13360 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 03:51:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13361 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 04:05:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Mr. Murray, Superintendent

I am happy to be an American and have the opportunity to express my views. I also want to say that I appreciate your willingness to welcome comments on this issue that has been controversial for several decades.

I disagree with the NPS statement that even with resource closure, protected species are still at risk from pedestrians and ORVs.

I do agree with the NPS statement that ORVs have long served as a primary form of access to many portions of the beaches along the seashore. Many locals and visitors enjoy the unique opportunity to drive on the beaches.

I do support a reasonable closed area for bird nesting and believe that locals and visitors would be respectful and protective of such small areas.

However, the 1,000 meter distance is too large. Second, the enforcement and punishment of trespassers (tire tracks or broken roped off post)of extending restrictions are clearly unfair. NPS needs to monitor and prosecute such individuals rather than punishing everyone in general.

The economic impact of beach closure and closure of Cape Point greatly affects our business economy. Many locals are employed in vacation property management and many homeowners rely upon rental income to support their investments.

Likewise, the restriction of pets accessing the beaches, campgrounds and soundfront is unfair and unnecessary. The majority of pet owners are

responsible individuals.

Finally, in restricted areas, beach access is still needed. A small access path or route could be provided.

I think a reasonable balance to this situation is possible and your attention and fair approach of protecting and not prohibiting is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Stuart Pack Resident of Kill Devil Hills, NC.

Correspondence ID: 13362 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 04:09:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: ORV access must be maintained as there are no alternates to access the National Seashore. There is not enough parking and beach walk-overs to access the beach, ORVs are the primary means of access. My mother-in-law visits with us every year and has limited mobility. With my ORV she can access and enjoy Cape Hatteras National Seashore (CHNS). CHNS is a national park which provides recreation for people, it is not a wildlife refuge. To the north and south of CHNS are Pea Island and Portsmouth Island, which do provides refuge for wildlife. The size of the buffers for the piping plover are too large and restrictive, there should be a corridor to access the beach that will bypass the plovers. The shut down the entire south and north points of Ocracoke for a plover chick is ridiculous. Do not have fees for ORV use, instead use education and have mandatory training for how to safely operate their ORV within CHNS. I have been safely operating my ORV since 1998 on CHNS and have never been stuck nor struck any person, animal or object. I have faithfully served in the U.S. Army for over 26 years and am a career officer with combat tours in Iraq. During my deployments I count the days until I come home and can visit CHNS with my family. I have the utmost respect for the National Park Service and want to see the right thing being done to make CHNS a place for people to visit and enjoy for generations to come. I visit CHNS about 6 times per year and contribute to the local economy. Please continue to provide access for ORVs.

Correspondence ID: 13363 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Covington-Huff, Carol D
Received: May,11,2010 04:14:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please, please, please: do not allow vehicles on the beach. The presence of SUVs completely spoils everyone's enjoyment of this most beautiful place. Let's keep this area a natural treasure, not turn it into another Florida beach home to 'girls gone wild.' We need to be able to hear the waves, not engines--and smell the good salt air, not gasoline.

Correspondence ID: 13364 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kuster, Heidi M
Received: May,11,2010 04:28:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I understand much work has gone into creating the Alternatives A through F. I have a number of concerns about the Park Service's preferred alternative F. I disagree with the 1000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for piping plover unfledged chick brood (p. 121-127). As stated in the Virginian Pilot on May 9,2010, "no scientific reasoning" has been presented "for this management strategy." The impact of this rule could cause closures not just in ORV areas but may close the beach in front of houses. The financial impact of visitors renting ocean front/ocean side houses and being unable to walk out on the beach in front of "their house" would devastate Hatteras Island. I disagree with the 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for any American Oystercatcher nest or brood, as the Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species (p121-127). Again, the unnecessary closure of beaches and consequent lack of access to the beach and ocean for pedestrians (and ORVs)is not sensible. We own a beach front home in AVON, and if buffer areas are extended -- and used for non federally threatened species it is highly likely the beach would be closed in front of ocean front houses that visitors have rented. I disagree with the Alternative F rule that No pets, including dogs, will be permitted on Cape Hatteras National Seashore lands including the beaches between March 15th and July 31st (p 136). This rule has no benefit for the preservation of birds or turtles. If people are allowed in an area, than a dog on a leash is of no environmental concern. I have heard numerous times from visitors on the island that they come to Hatteras because we are "pet friendly" on the beach. Should this rule be put in place Hatteras Island's spring and summer business will be adversely impacted a. Additionally many year round homeowners have pets and walking on the beach is the only place to exercise dogs. We have very limited sidewalks and no walking trails on Hatteras Island. I agree that the NPS needs to have a viable management plan for OUR park lands. I encourage all involved to take a balanced approach.
Sincerely, Homeowner in Avon, North Carolina Heidi Kuster

Correspondence ID: 13365 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 04:34:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV.
Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.
In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community.
Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.
Sincerely,
Colton R. West

Correspondence ID: 13366 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Morris, John
Received: May,11,2010 04:39:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with NPS offroad vehicle management plan due to the fact that the socio-economic impact study is completely inaccurate. As a small business owner I am deeply concerned. The analysis was generated on faulty data. I hope that whoever reads this will understand that without beaches why would anyone want to come to an island. A drastic reduction in visitors to this island would cause my business to go bankrupt. I will loose my beautiful home and life that I have established on Hatteras Island. Thank you for taking the time to read this, and I hope the park service will do the right thing in the intrest of nature and the residents of Hatteras Island. Thank, John Morris

Correspondence ID:	13367	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 04:44:39						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." <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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.</p> <p>Sincerely, William O. Butler</p>						
Correspondence ID:	13368	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	WELLS, JOSEPH W						
Received:	May,11,2010 04:47:55						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I would suggest that we have 2 marked travel paths only on the beach with a speed limit of 6 mph. Also not take away the old road north of Rodanthe at the S turns for parking as it is needed for surfing parking. It will be increasingly dangerous situation especially in summertime. Also accessibility to the beach for foottraffic not taken away, If one could walk the high tide line in areas closed for bird closure as it would not affect the bird nesting. The closure of the beaches has been too extreme with lack of enforcement or extreme enforcement. Also better signs educating people to the delicate situation of bird nesting with pictures of the birds. President Nixon ordered this in 1974 and I cannot believe it took this long to set a policy. Also marked paths every 1/4 to 1/2 mile with a stairway over the dunes that could be retrieved on the ocean side in event of a storm washaway. Thank you.</p>						
Correspondence ID:	13369	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Allen, Sandra F						
Received:	May,11,2010 04:51:49						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>May 10, 2010 Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>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. I do not understand the justification for the restrictiveness of Alternative F. I support the Coalition for Beach Access Proposal. Even the title of the Management Plan (an overwhelmingly voluminous report) is misleading. As I have studied the issue, I see that the access restriction is not only to off-road vehicles, but also to human, pedestrian traffic.</p> <p>It seems to me that the evidence of harm to wildlife warranting such strict access is very lacking.</p> <p>I am very concerned that the National Park Service, funded by the tax dollars of the American people, is taking a stance that unfairly restricts our access to nature and to recreational sites. Recreation is so important for people, and it is one of the reasons these beautiful lands entrusted to the organization you represent have been preserved. Please reconsider this move to unreasonably restrict human access to the beaches of Hatteras Island.</p> <p>Sincerely, Sandra F. Allen Concerned Dare County Resident, US taxpayer, with much appreciation for nature</p>						
Correspondence ID:	13370	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 04:53:56						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>KEEP OUR BEACHES OPEN!!!! why is it that we must share our beaches and possibly loose access to them for these birds, BUT they aren't having to share themselves. obviously they are birds and can't actually be held responsible for their actions, but it seems CRAZY that they have the potential to ruin our entire island's economy! My husband and I are a young couple with a 2 year old. We just bought a house here on the island a few years ago because we've been here for years and love this place, and now we could loose it all because of these BIRDS!!!! Why can't we find a way to live with these birds rather than fight against them and everyone who is a part of trying to take away our beach access because of them??? There has to be a better solution. Our beaches closing will be absolutely detrimental to so many families just like ours who are fighting so hard as it is to keep a roof over our heads in this economic time! We depend on our tourism & this could take a major toll on the entire county. PLEASE, PLEASE, PLEASE find a better way, they are just BIRDS!!!! Do we all mean nothing???</p>						
Correspondence ID:	13371	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 04:54:12						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	<p>I disagree with the NPS prohibition of horses in the seashore during the bird breeding season (p 136). Culturally, horses have been on the islands since the "Banker Ponies" well over 100 years ago. Economically, the business that supply horses to tourists will be put out of business if this alternative is chosen. In addition, there are many visitors for whom horseback riding on the beach is an integral part of their beach experience. Preventing access by horses is punitive and unnecessary.</p>						

Correspondence ID:	13372	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	LaFleur, Terry					
Received:	May,11,2010 04:54:53					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I was born in PA and moved to NC in 1995 and resided in Wilmington NC, I frequently traveled to the National Park for bird watching, walking the beautiful beaches and surf fishing with my husband and family. Since moving to NH for business in 2001 we continue to travel to our beloved Ocracoke Island several times a year for the same reasons. We have always commented on how the economic footprint and the environmental concerns work together for the betterment of whole, unlike that of what we see in the northeast where access is difficult and limited. We were looking forward to moving to Ocracoke to live and open a small complimentary business. We have put our plans on hold until this matter is resolved. This park is so unique in the US, its important to preserve this historically American way of life. The residents of this are respectful of the environment and it shows. Respectfully, Terry LaFleur Diddies & Doodads 57 Pleasant Street Epping NH 03042					
Correspondence ID:	13373	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,11,2010 05:11:35					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I ride ATV's frequently, however I do believe such use should be limited, particularly in delicate areas such as Cape Hatteras where wildlife habitats can be damaged by overuse of ATV's or ORV's. Please limit the use of ORV's and help us to protect this wonderful area of our country for all of the people here to use for years to come.					
Correspondence ID:	13374	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,11,2010 05:12:07					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Tourism is a big business on the Outer Banks of NC. Keep shutting down the beach accesses and I will go where I can fish. Keep the beaches open to anglers!					
Correspondence ID:	13375	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	N/A, N/A					
Received:	May,11,2010 05:12:23					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I can't even believe there is a need for this action. If these birds are truly an issue then they should be relocated so that they are not causing problems anymore. If the people who feel that they are so entitled to change the world to suit themselves don't like it, they should leave too. I am ashamed of the local government for giving this so much attention. DO NOT RESTRICT BEACH ACCESS!!!					
Correspondence ID:	13376	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,11,2010 05:13:49					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray: I am stunned to realize you are planning to allow Off Road Vehicle use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources. 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals. <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. ***** 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,</p>					
Correspondence ID:	13377	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Lee, Susan					
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of 					

the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13378 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 05:21:18
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: 13379 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 05:24:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I only go to the outer banks periodically, but two years ago when I was there and walking on the beach North of Cape Hatteras I was nearly run down by a pickup truck, and struck by a beer bottle thrown by one of the people riding in the back of the truck. IF the park service can't get rid of driving on the beach, which would be the best option, at the very least the park service should try to do a better job warning people to stay off the beach at times when driving is allowed. It is sad the the park seems more friendly to racing pickup trucks than to families. GET THE VEHICLES OFF THE BEACH. There is a perfectly good road along the cape for people to drive on, there is no need to have vehicles on the beach as well.

Correspondence ID: 13380 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 05:25:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly agree with the letter that senator Basnight and rep. Tim Spear sent to the National Park Service. I also think that relocating some of the nest to safer areas is a good step in preservation. It seems that South Carolina has proven this. We need to have access to all of the areas year round while still respecting the lives of the wildlife in Question.

Correspondence ID: 13381 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Brown, Charles K
Received: May,11,2010 05:29:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Friends: THe use of motorized vehicles on beaches in Maine has not been allowed in my experience. A good part of the value and enjoyment of the beaches is the change made by nature. Motorized vehicles would also make changes, but of a different kind. Let the changes in the formation of the beaches everywhere be determined by storms and winds, not by vehicles
Corporate endeavors to save or change beaches rarely work as planned for any length of time.
Beaches are most valuable left to grow or dissappear on their own. Enjoy the changes,

Correspondence ID: 13382 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cobb, R j
Received: May,11,2010 05:32:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not agree that any part of the beach should be closed to pedestrian traffic should a nest for these such birds be found. It is my understanding that the nests for these birds are found away from the shore in between two dunes away from all pedestrian traffic.
I agree that if such a nest be found (actually found - not an assumption that one could be in that location) that the nest be protected with signs and ropes marking off an area of no more that 100 yards around said nest.At the present time miles of beach access is prohibited just on the assumption that a bird nest could be in that area. Bird nest protection should be handled in the same manner that turtle eggs are protected. The protection of turtle eggs works and the protection of these bird eggs would work if handled in the same such manner.
I do not agree that ORV should be prohibited on ramps 27-30, Hatteras Inlet or Ocracoke Inlet at any time of the year. Many tourist use these ramps to access the beach and these tourist will stop coming to Hatteras Island if they cannot use the beaches. This will be an economic disaster to the Island.

Correspondence ID:	13383	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Oliver, Stanley					
Received:	May,11,2010 05:32:44					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	To All, I do not think shrinking the beach area for fishermen is going to help the endangered animals and birds ..The beach here is just one piece of the problem ..What about other habitats used by the same birds..What about netters and introduced Predators ? I oppose this method and believe that some people with input would approve of no Human joy from the seashore parks which is not there intent.. Stanley					
Correspondence ID:	13384	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Hagan, John C					
Received:	May,11,2010 05:33:56					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I have surf fished the coast of NC for over 35 years. The fishermen believe in preserving the outer banks for future generations. The fishermen are the heart and soul of the coastal communities. These communities will be punished and financially impacted by the proposed regulations on endangered species and the offroad vehicle plans. Please do your part to encourage tourism and the future for these areas. John Hagan					
Correspondence ID:	13385	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Groetsch, Jack A					
Received:	May,11,2010 05:35:37					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I am a resident of Hatteras Island, and I support protecting wildlife, but with balance and keeping all interests in mind, therefore, I do not support the proposed Park Service Plan F because it extends protection to non-threatened birds and it does not keep with the original intent of the original parties, (local residents and federal government), whose intention was to have a seashore available for public recreation.					
Correspondence ID:	13386	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Myers, James W					
Received:	May,11,2010 05:35:49					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	This is a national park - how can you stop people from going to a national park - our taxes pay for this. My husband has been going down there to fish for over 20 years. The fisherman respect the land and the animals down there. Cant say that for the NPS - they are trapping and killing predators of these birds. Isn't there something called the "Circle of Life"? And why is it these bird lovers get access to the beach but fisherman and any one else can't? The fisherman pay for fishing licenses and for many other things. They really help the economy down there. These bird lovers get free access and dont have to pay for a thing. This is another way for the US Govt and organizations to control other people lives and livelihoods. Never in my life would I have thought that fishing and enjoying myself would be banned from a national park. These birds and wildlife have been there for years and will continue to be there for years - this is just an organization that doesnt like people to fish. Why wasnt these bird lovers in VA a few years ago when it was OK to kill as many of these birds as possible at the HRBT? These parks were set up a long time ago for people to HUNT, FISH, CAMP and Enjoy the outdoors. Please do not take this away from us. There are quite a few people who still enjoy being outdoors and enjoying these activities. Why is the US Govt/ NPS allowing a small group of people to dictate what every one else does?					
Correspondence ID:	13387	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,11,2010 05:43:38					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I am writing as a property owner in Avon, North Carolina. Please keep the beaches open. Closing them will devastate the local economy, which as you know is almost entirely tourism-based. Additionally, closing the beaches will further depress housing prices which are already off significantly and probably more then the rest of North Carolina and most of the country. Many of the local folks are already struggling to get by. I fear closing the beaches will only make their situation worse. Certainly a reasonable compromise can be achieved.					
Correspondence ID:	13388	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	PATCH JR, FRANK H					
Received:	May,11,2010 05:47:41					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	PLEASE KEEP OUR SHORES ACCESIBLE TO ORV SURF FISHERMAN. ESPECIALLY AROUND THE POINTS WHERE SURF FISHING IS AT ITS BEST. MAYBE THERE IS A WAY TO SEPARATE THE SURF FISHERMAN FROM THE RECREATIONAL BEACH GOING ORV'S. POSSIBLY SOME BEACHGOERS SHOULD HAVE ACCESS TO NORTHERN BEACHES AWAY FROM THE POINTS AND SURF FISHERMAN ACCESS TO MORE SOUTHERN RAMPS AND THE POINTS. THIS COULD SEPARATE THE MORE WILDLIFE CONCIOUS FISHERMAN FROM THE TOURIST AND BEACH GOERS. IF POSSIBLE MAYBE A SEASON COULD BE DESIGNATED FOR FISHING ACCESS TO THE POINTS. PLEASE DO NOT KEEP OUR SURF FISHING TADITIONS ALIVE, IT IS ONE THE ONLY ALTERNALTIVE'S TO EXPENSIVE OFF SHORE FISHING THAT ANYONE CAN ENJOY. THANKS					
Correspondence ID:	13389	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I am a resident of North Carolina who enjoys recreational opportunities offered by the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area.Reasonable and safe pedestrian and vehicular access to the beach is essential to participate and enjoy these resources and opportunities. I also support restrictions and conditions necessary to protect the birds, sea turtles, and other biota that are supported by scientific data and can make the Seashore home for part of the year. I believe the favor alternative (#7) advanced by the NPS is more restrictive than necessary to meet the protection of the Seashore. I have read and agreed with the proposal to manage ORV's on the Seashore prepared and submitted for consideration by the Coalition for Beach Access. My position is that the NPS accept this alternative or at least postpone a final decision on the ORV plan pending further review and negotiation on the counterpoints raised by the Coalition for Beach Access.					
Correspondence ID:	13390	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Burch, Christine L					
Received:	May,11,2010 05:49:18					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I am currently a homeowner on Hatteras Island have been visiting Cape Hatteras National Seashore for over 33 years. I agree that there needs to a					

predictable and fair plan for accessing our beaches. There are several items that need to be addressed that will help provide a balanced and reasonable plan to protect and provide access to our national seashore shores.

1) Large, inflexible buffers (p.121-127). These buffers that are being considered in the DEIS of 1,000 meter buffer in all directions for the piping plover is to large to allow a balance of human use of the seashore as stated in the original "Park Enabling Legislation". The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such large closures and these extremely large buffers are not used in other federal and state areas for the piping plover! A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters

2) Non-endangered species, such as American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Water birds are given Pre-Nesting closures and buffers up to 300 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300 meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters

Following is an excerpt from a May 9, 2010 Virginian-Pilot news article by Catherine Kozak: This shows that the "species of concern" was not intended to be used as an additional ESA list.

*State-listed "species of concern," - such as the American oystercatcher - do not require the extensive buffers and beach closures mandated for federally listed species such as the piping plover, said Gordon Myers, the executive director of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission. Myers said that's beyond the intent of the state law: the state designation is supposed to be more of a call to action for a species. The Wildlife Resource Commission, he said, will voice its objections to the use of state "species of concern" lists to trigger ORV management strategies under the federal Endangered Species Act.

3) Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open area that would otherwise be blocked. In alternative F Corridors are only allowed in ML-2 portions of SMA's and are subject to resource closures at any time. In a more reasonable approach Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMA's. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources

4) Turtle Management (Pg.125, 392-396) DEIS claims North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission turtle guidelines will be followed. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas and this would allow better access to beach areas for visitors enjoyment and night driving and fishing.

5) Prohibition of Pets (p136) in the seashore during bird breeding season, including in front of the villages. No pets in public areas, beaches, campgrounds, sound-front, foot trails, park maintained roads from March 15 -July 31 The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science supporting that such a ban on pets would have any positive impact on the breeding birds over the current rules of pets on 6ft leash.

6) Year Round Closures: Hatteras Inlet, North End Ocracoke Island, Ramp 27-Ramp 30 (Salvo) are set to be closed year round to ORV, I am most familiar with the Hatteras inlet area and this area does not have the characteristics of prime habitat for the plover and the other supposed reason for the closure was the need for a pedestrian only area. It would not be economically or environmentally feasible to pave "pole road" and create parking lots in a beautiful and natural setting at the Hatteras Inlet. The need for pedestrian only areas is addressed in adjacent 15 miles of beach on Pea Island, which never gets included in the amount of beach for pedestrian only and is also a wildlife refuge.

7) Economical Impact: the negative economical impact of the "consent decree" has been profound and well documented. Any projected financial losses from these changes will only affect the businesses that are on Hatteras and Ocracoke islands and the impact studies should reflect that and not be spread across the region to lessen the negative financial impact on the villages.

Correspondence ID: 13391 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Benson, John
Received: May,11,2010 05:49:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: One final comment on the NPS DEIS. After reading the Turtle Management Plan just released by the Coalition for Access group I felt that I must make one more comment. It is becoming painfully obvious to me that the NPS DEIS and their preferred alternative are written solely to limit orv and pedestrian access to the Cape Hatteras beaches, rather than to protect the wildlife that also uses these beaches. I disagree with the DEIS in its entirety and request that the NPS use the draft environmental impact statement and the turtle recovery plan as provided by the Coalition for beach access and that the ORV plan provided by the Coalition be selected as the NPS preferred alternative. Management of the seashore as prescribed in the Consent Decree has not lead to increases in targeted species. Instead, it has lead to economic loss and loss of quality of life to the residents of and visitors to the Cape Hatteras Seashore. It has also lead to extreme visual pollution of these beautiful beaches caused by the uncountable number of signs that have been placed within the Seashore by the NPS over the past 2 years. One of NPS's reasons for being is to maintain the beauty of the lands they protect. They have failed miserably here, causing all of the visual pollution by their own actions. Please help us, the people who live and visit within the Seashore, to return it to what it once was..... a place to be loved and enjoyed by the people of the United States. It was designated by congress to be a National Recreation Area, not a National Wildlife Refuge.

Correspondence ID: 13392 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Maxwell, Andrew S
Received: May,11,2010 05:50:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The current orv plan going being voted on will destroy this island.
I am concerned about the following:
1. Not permitting access to the beaches eliminates the possibility of raising our children to respect the environment. This lack of knowledge will create generations of adults that do not respect the environment.
2. For some people, recreation on this island was the only form of relaxation in a work a day world. People will have a substantial source of happiness removed from their lives.
3. Killing predators while physically protecting the pray is playing god. This is wrong. I will personally do work to stop you from killing animals that are simply trying to live their natural lives.
4. Not allowing pets to be on park land is insane. The leash law protects the birds from dogs and should be enforced.
Please listen to these comments as you are beginning to destroy countless lives that depend on beach access.
Andrew Maxwell

Correspondence ID: 13393 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 05:51:19
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.
Please provide a plan that will result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. I think it is obvious that most people go to the shore or any park for an exscape from cars and trucks etc. Please do the right thing and keep the park pleasant for people and wildlife. Let's protect the natural resources of the Seashore!

Correspondence ID: 13394 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 05:51:19
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: 13395 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 05:56:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

My wife and I have been vacationing on the outer banks since 1995, and decided to build our dream home, in which we would someday retire. Most of the reason we chose the outer banks, is of course the beaches, and access that we enjoy to those beaches to be able to swim, relax and fish with our family. We also rent out our home, and for the time being, is the only way we can afford to have a home in this beautiful place. We are not rich people who can afford to take a loss on the home if we have to sell it. If these beach restrictions go through as proposed, we will most likely lose most, if not all, of our rental income on the property, and this will have a devastating effect on my families' finances. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a "NATIONAL" seashore, set aside for recreation by the federal government, for use by the people of this country. I understand the need to protect wildlife, as I work for the New Jersey Dept. of Environmental Protection. I have never witnessed any person driving on the beach, or walking on the beaches that have destroyed any bird or turtle nest in all my years of coming to the Outer Banks. In fact, I see many more people concerned about the animals on the island and also many more people picking up trash on the beach, than I see people leaving trash. I love to fish, and am really worried that this will be taken away from me if your proposal implemented. Please dont let special interest groups, who have NO personal stake in this situation, take over Cape Hatteras National Seashore. There are so few places left like this that people can come and enjoy..We live in NJ, and we know what it is like to NOT have a place like Cape Hatteras to come to and enjoy. The effects of this plan will be devastating to the island and its residents and visitors alike. I dont understand why the National Park Service would ever allow this to happen to a place so many people come and enjoy? Isnt that the National Park Service's Job? to maintain our nations parks for people to come and enjoy them? What's next? will they close Yellowstone National Park and Yosemite to cars and vistors as well?
 Please help us, and everyone else who loves to come and visit this beautiful place...Sincerely. Tim and Doreen Nuss

Correspondence ID: 13396 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 06:00:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray,
 Please do not approve off road vehicles (ORV) at 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.

Correspondence ID: 13397 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Myers, Dee
Received: May,11,2010 06:05:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I dont think anyone has the right to stop people from fishing, hunting, camping and enjoying the outdoors. I love going down there and fishing. Why is it that the only place those bird lovers want is where the best fishing is? They have Pea Island - go there and watch the birds. Nothing gets said about that. or close the beaches down where people go and just lay on the beach. They leave trash and all kinds of things. The fisherman leave the beach clean and follow all the rules. They support the economy down there. These parks were set up to fish, hunt, camp and be outdoors. What gives Us Govt / NPS / and organizations a right to stop that? And talk about keeping the sacred animals alive - why is it that NPS and other people are allowed to KILL and

TRAP animals for a few birds? These birds have been there for a VERY LONG time and will continue to be there. The Point last year was covered in water - the tide had come in. Now is those bird lovers going to stop the water from coming in to keep these birds alive? Stop contolling people - Stop telling people what they can and cannot do - Stop taking the Americas past time away.

Correspondence ID: 13398 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 06:07:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like access for pedestrians and orv's to remain as free and open as possible.

Correspondence ID: 13399 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Everett, Lisa
Received: May,11,2010 06:09:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do NOT agree with the beach closures!

Correspondence ID: 13400 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Higham, James J
Received: May,11,2010 06:10:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Comments of the DEIS
James J Higham 4709 Windsong Drive Virginia Beach, VA 23455
To whom it may concern, Below are my comments to the DEIS for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I hope you find them substantive and use them for your decision making in the FEIS.
Sincerely,
James J Higham
First of let me begin with the enabling legislation by Congress which established the seashore. In it is stated "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, particularly swimming, boating, sailing, fishing, and other recreational activities of similar nature, which shall be developed for such uses as needed". This area in my opinion is to mean the points and spits contained in CAHA. Also the enabling legislation states "said area is set aside for the benefit and enjoyment of the people". This is how the park should be managed according the enabling legislation as specifically provided for by Congress. In the Organic Act, the last part of it states "unless specifically provided for by Congress" which CAHA is. Therefore recreation is the predominate use of CAHA and should remain so. In my opinion no-action alternative A is the best way to accomplish this based on the enabling legislation. My next comment has to do with the promises made to the residents of CAHA and the visitors by then NPS director Conrad Wirth. Which states "there will always be access to the beach for all people, whether they are local residents or visitors from the outside." I sure wish NPS would have kept this promise. From the enabling legislation and the promises made by the then NPS director, I believe NPS should manage CAHA as a recreational area as was specifically provided for by Congress and should keep the promise to have access to the beach for residents and visitors alike. After all, the enabling legislation is law. Next I would like to talk about the socioeconomic impact to the area. I believe not enough emphasis is placed on this subject in the DEIS. There are no boardwalks, shopping malls, amusement parks and the like contained within CAHA. The beach (for a broad general term) is the draw. Take away the beach and the reason for coming to CAHA ceases to exist. I have seen the economic devastation caused by the Consent Decree, and the preferred Alternative F will inflict much dire economic effects to an already damaged economy. Say what you want about the economy nationwide, but CAHA has largely been unaffected by economic downturns in the nation. But when the Consent Decree took effect in May of 2008 there was a substantial drop in visitation. Many people simply did not come to CAHA because of the beaches being closed. Over the years I have met and befriended many Islanders. I see the devastation caused by the Consent Decree, and the preferred Alternative is surely going to make a bad situation worse. I hope NPS does what is required by NEPA and place a strong emphasis on the socioeconomic impacts that the preferred alternative would create. The places I most like to access are the points and spits of CAHA. As you may know, many of these areas are very far from the nearest parking lot, and would require a substantial walk to the aforementioned areas. It is simply not possible to walk there loaded down with fishing gear, coolers, provisions, fishing rods, chairs, waders, foul weather gear, binoculars, ect. Even those in great physical condition cannot effectively access the area without an ORV. To effectively fish the area an ORV is a requirement, just as those fishing in the ocean use a boat, a surf-fisherman uses an ORV. When fishing the beach, much of the beach is not good fishing, however the points and spits are the areas where fish congregate. Therefore that is where I concentrate my efforts. Those areas among others I have historically accessed by an ORV and have never ran over a bird or turtle. I have the utmost respect for CAHA and the wildlife contained therein. I operate my ORV in a safe, law abiding manner, as do the majority of the users. I am a member of the Outer Banks Preservation Association, and abide by their motto which is "preserve and protect, not prohibit". I also really enjoy using the beach at night. It is one of my favorite things to see the foxes, shooting stars, night skies, the milky way, minks and all of the beauty of the beach at night. I enjoy a nice fire on the beach not to mention the fishing is usually better at night. With the night driving prohibition from May 1 through September 15 I go somewhere where I can drive at night like Assateague Island. I have cut my visitation to CAHA in the spring to zero and now only come down in the fall. I really miss CAHA in the spring and hope NPS adopts no-action alternative A. The science in the DEIS troubles me very much. It speaks about people and ORVs in a very disturbing light. Most of the science states that people and ORVs are a problem, but what it fails to mention is that the effects are if ORVs and people are not managed, but at CAHA they have been managed for some time. Also, the science just shows how detrimental ORVs and people are and does not say how the two can coexist. This is a travesty, as people and wildlife have coexisted at CAHA for a very long time. It does nothing to solve the problem that NPS has created by not managing the habitat, and letting it deteriorate to force the birds out on the beach where disturbance, weather, and predation is a problem. Nothing in the DEIS goes to solve the problem of people and wildlife, and instead would rather just prohibit access, instead of managing the two as it is their mission statement to do. In regards to night driving, I recommend that red tape be mandated for use by people wanting to use ORVs at night. This could mitigate any potential impacts to sea turtles. Not to mention the fact that there have been no studies done to date to qualify or quantify effects on nesting sea turtles at CAHA regarding use of the beach at night. The park and stay option is another idea that could be implemented at CAHA. This would allow night time use, while mitigating potential impacts. Another step the NPS should take is to identify areas of the seashore that is preferred nesting habitat for turtles, or areas that have historically high concentrations of nesting, and prohibit night driving there. Referring to the points and spits, the high value of recreational usage should remain open to nighttime ORV use as a pass thru or a park and stay option with no lantern use, mandating red tape over the headlights, and a suggestion to use as little light as possible. As far as Colonial Waterbirds go, NPS should not have to do pilot studies as it pertains to adaptive management. Had the NPS been managing the habitat all along, the birds could nest away from the beach where forage abundance is greater, potential weather and disturbance impacts are much less and people could access the beach with fewer user conflicts. Why not use habitat manipulation to create habitat at the brackish pond at Cape Point? The birds can be more successful and people can have access to the beach. In regards to much of the potential habitat at CAHA, much of it is overgrown with vegetation. I recommend NPS clear the vegetation and manage the habitat to support these colonies of birds. Another problem I have with the DEIS is the buffer distances used. I understand USFWS protection protocols suggest 1000 meters around Piping Plover chicks, but that distance is too great. The unfledged chicks forage in the same general area, and do not move very much, therefore, if the habitat manipulation were successful at Cape Point, then the beaches could be open and the birds could be more successful. In regards to terns, skimmers, and oystercatchers, why not create more dredge islands in the sound? Clearly the birds are more successful there so why not encourage them to nest there? Also, the least terns appear to be very successful on rooftops, so why can't the NPS create something similar at CAHA? The terns and skimmers would be more successful and people could have access to the beach. In regards to Oystercatchers, the birds have much more success on the dredge islands, so why not encourage them to nest there? Look at the fledgling rates for Green Island, could the NPS duplicate that success in other areas of the seashore at the same time keeping the beaches open? Can NPS do this with all species of birds while at the same time keeping access to the

beaches open? I believe NPS can fulfill this mission best with a modified Interim Management Strategy (IMS). Recommendations for a modified IMS. -Mandate red tape for night-time ORV use during the sea-turtle nesting season -Utilize park and stay option at the point and spits -Use adaptive management very wisely to afford as much access as possible -Mandate an ORV permit with a substantial educational component -Mandate an entrance fee for all users, with an education component for all including non-ORV users, as they are the biggest resource violators. -Use habitat manipulation to create and enhance CWB nesting success -Do a better job with sea turtle nests that are in danger of egg and hatchling loss by moving the nests to areas that will have a better chance of hatching success and to areas of low recreational value. -Put a gate on CAHA and charge an admittance fee for all visitors and exempt residents who reside within the boundaries of CAHA. At time of admittance this is where the educational component can be administered. As pedestrians are the biggest resource violators, this component could be very valuable in the compliance of closures and the cost recovery could be shouldered by the entirety of the user groups instead of just ORV permit holders. -Use wardening as a tool to keep as much access as possible open. -Increase enforcement of the existing laws already on the books to increase compliance. -Increase the amount of interdunal access points and roads. -Increase the amount of access ramps so the areas that are closed for resource protection can be bypassed. -Increase/create bypass routes behind the dunes for safety closures and resource closures especially in proposed SMA. -Do not make both sides of Hatteras Inlet a non-ORV area as the area is of high value to recreation and is "especially adaptable for fishing" and "should be developed for that purpose as needed" as per the enabling legislation. Not only the aforementioned but the fact that the area has not been utilized by Piping Plovers for some time. -I respectfully request that you use the coalition for beach access statement as an addition to the IMS and the suggestions noted above.

In closing, thank you for the chance to submit public comment and I respectfully request a full disclosure of the science to the National Academy of Sciences for a non-biased review.

James J Higham 4709 Windsong Drive Apt 201 Virginia Beach, VA 23455

Correspondence ID: 13401 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Following are my suggested improvements to the ORV DEIS.

1. Commercial fishing vehicles have already their own permits (xxx), and given their long history on the ocean beach (19), I believe they should be give corridors through resource closures.(viii,xi) The ramps were originally created for them (20). That commercial fishermen are not given corridors through resource closures is inconsistent with their being allowed through safety closures (xxi) and having more night driving time (xxx). Some might say this is special treatment, and I agree. I disagree with the statement that they are non-essential vehicles (xxx). They provide food for our people. There could at least have been a definition of essential vehicle food given in the DEIS, instead of referring the reader to a piping plover document. This definitely shows that plovers are rated above the descendants of the original people that settled these islands. Even the ESA recognizes that a long history of species coexisting together is evidence that one is no great harm to the other. This is why Alaskan natives are exempt. The piping plover is not even endangered.

2. A buffer with 1,000 meters diameter could cover all private land on Ocracoke Island (121-127). Thus it is not a buffer, but just a more politically correct way of saying "no access".

3. Much was made of the fact that that of US National Seashores only Cape Hatteras has seen a decline in piping plover numbers in recent years (121-127). There has also been an increase in ORV use. Every scientist knows that "correlation does not necessarily imply causation". The Pamlico Sound area is very large and unique in the US. They are many other places immediately outside the seashore that are good bird habitat. This may not be true to such an extent for the other seashores. There should be a study of how this factor might figure into bird counts.

Correspondence ID: 13402 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 06:11:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My parents started bringing me, my brother and sister to the Outer Banks when we toddlers, I'm 60 yo now.He'd drive a Willy Jeep from then Norfolk County,VA (now Chesapeake) to the VA Beach oceanfront Sandbridge area, turn right and we wouldn't stop till we got to Nags Head. Spend the night on the beach in a tent and go home on Sunday. If we were on vacation, we'd take the ferry to Hatteras, hit beach and drive to the end. Those times were the best times. We learned many life lessons on those trips. He was at Normandy June 6 1944, Bastion and Hitlers Headquarters in Germany. Why am I telling you this. As an American soldier, he was taught to leave a site as if no one had ever been there. He taught us that lesson every time we visited the Outer Banks. Today,when me and my family leave the beach, it's cleaner than when we found it. You never would know we were there. I have a Jeep and I drive on the beaches. To see the sun come up at Hatteras is like seeing the hand of God. To stop beach access would deny future generations the beauty of Hatteras.My generation has taught our kids to respect our natural resorces..leave it better than you found it. I strongly support the Coalition for Beach Access Position Paper. Thank You for letting me share my comments. Jim Sheppard, Moyock,NC.

Correspondence ID: 13403 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 06:15:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Murry, As a frequent and long time visitor to the nations parks system, especially Cape Hatteras National Seashore I am deeply disturbed at some of the positions the NPS is proposing in the DEIS plan published on March 12 2010. I understand and agree with the NPS duties to protect and preserve our natural resources. My main area of concern is when in the protection of these resources the NPS over steps its bounds, and in the case of the CHNS, completely restricts the public to the point that this wonderful magnificent resource cannot be enjoyed by most citizens who wish to spend time there. My main issues of concern are as follows and I have several questions which I don't think you addressed in the original DEIS plan. 7 I disagree with the restrictions (as proposed in Alternative "F" p. 97-101) of the ORV access between ramps 27 and 30 at the Hatteras Inlet, Ocracoke Inlet, and all other locations in the park. There must be a method to allow pedestrian and ORV access points to these areas without disturbing the natural resources.

7 I disagree with the severe restrictions (as proposed in Alternative "F" p. 104) not allowing night driving in the park. Over the past 40 years I have witnessed and enjoyed hundreds of sunsets and sunrises which cannot be viewed from any other areas in the park with the same majestic experience. These night closures would significantly reduce the time that the many fishermen can enjoy the resources at a time of day (during the PM hours) when the fishing can be the most productive and active. Given the right instruction on how to access these areas I know that all the individuals I have seen over the years could enjoy the park without disturbing the natural resource.

7 I disagree with the prohibition of pedestrian access (as proposed in Alternative "F" p. 121) at the 8 different park locations from March 15 to July 31 each year. These locations have traditionally been available for all to enjoy. The removal of such large tracks of the park limits the overall positive experience that the park has to offer and significantly reduces ones desire to return to the seashore.

7 I disagree with the drastic and large restrictions (as proposed in Alternative "F" p.121-127) put on the public's ability to access certain parts of the beach when a piping plover or American Oystercatcher nest or brood exists in the park. These closures of such large tracts of park lands makes enormous parts of the park non accessible by the public. There must be a common sense compromise which both protects the natural resource and does not prohibit pedestrian and ORV access to some of the most valued parts of the park to visit.

7 I disagree with the NO PET restriction (as proposed in Alternative "F" p. 136) from March 15 to July 31. This restriction must be reconsidered with a more stringent enforcement of the current 6' leash rule, year round. Over the 40 years I have been enjoying CHNS my family and hundreds of park guests I have seen and obeyed the current pet rules with no damage to the natural resource. You must consider that too many individuals, the only important thing in their lives is their pets. These individuals treat their pets as one of their family and would treat the park with the same respect. I disagree with the restriction of public access with their pets in front of the many homes and businesses in the many towns that share, respect, and have

been the primary caretakers of this area even before the NPS was there.

I disagree and take real exception to the NPS analyses of the socio-economic impact of the actions taken in the DEIS and the negative drastic effect it will have on the region and the state of N.C. as stated on p. 270-286 , 561-598. For the NPS to state as they do on p. 383 that the local region will have to "adapt" to the new rules I find insulting to the hardworking people in the region who have nothing but the best interest of the park for their entire lives. I have seen the effects of what some of the types of restrictions imposed over the last couple of years by the Federal Court Consent Decree will do to the local region. The loss of business, jobs, homes, and the noticeable loss of tourism has all been a direct effect to the restrictions on park access. The NPS proposal in the DEIS, Alternative "F" is more restrictive then the Consent Decree and therefore could be more damaging then what's already in place. There are many alternatives used in our society to allow public use to coexist without disturbing our natural resources. Many of these approaches the NPS uses in other parks in the park system. In Alternative "F" of the DEIS plan the NPS is taking the more restrictive approach at the expense of the public use. There is no credible science to back up the NPS plan in Alternative "F" and a less restrictive approach must be taken to allow both public use and resource management of one of the nation's most valuable resource.

Correspondence ID: 13404 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 06:17:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: THERE HAS GOT TO BE A WAY TO PROTECT THE BIRDS WHILE PROTECTING OUR RIGHT TO USE THE CAPE HATTERAS PARK IN HARMONY.....PLEASE DO NOT DENY THE ASSESS AND USE OF OUR PARK.....REMEMBER THAT HUMANS ARE ONE GODS CREATIONS.....
 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED
 CARL WORSLEY

Correspondence ID: 13405 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Barclay, Stephen w
Received: May,11,2010 06:19:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: National Park Service Service,
 We strongly agree with the position statements and concerns put forth by the Coalition For Beach Access regarding the DEIS as proposed the National Park Service for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation area. This collage of groups has responded to the proposed DEIS with viable alternatives which provide shared usage and best preserve the Recreation Area in terms of its environmental, social, economic, and cultural needs. We understand and appreciate the efforts of the NPS for providing guardianship of the lands of the citizens of United States but let us not forget the citizens as well as the flora and fauna. We find the exaggerated domain(buffer zone) for the Piping Plover and the Oyster Cracker(not endangered) limits access to the surf zone and is excessive and punitive. We must remember since 1937 when the CHNSRA was formed the locals gave their lands to the NPS with the promise of forever access for commerce(then fishing, now tourism) and recreation. Now that access is being threatened(sound familiar).The economic impact will be devesating, particularly during this current depression/recession. Perhaps, easing the restrictions of the DEIS and adding those as needed is a more prudent plan. As trained biologists, watersports enthusiasts,surf fisherman, Avon homeowners, and wildlife lovers we implore you to listen to reason and reconsider your plans for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
 Thank you, Stephen Barclay DMD Lynnanne Barclay RPh

Correspondence ID: 13406 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Skibinski, Joseph
Received: May,11,2010 06:19:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern: As a longtime property owner in Avon I feel compelled to address and take issue with the proposed Off-Road vehicle management plan. On pg 201 you state that protected species are at-risk from ORV use. For the record, no Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs! On pgs.121-127 the proposed buffer zone needs to be adjusted. The 1000 meter distance for the Piping Plover is way too large and is scientifically inadequate. There appears to be no absolute evidence to support this distance and the distance number is arbitrary and relative. I strongly disagree with the closure policies. Human interference has very little effect on the beach ecosystem including success rates of birds and other animals. On pgs 270-281, 561-598 I really disagree with the economic analysis. On a micocosmic scale , my rental income and number of rented weeks has dropped significantly due to the uncertainty of beach access. My situation is not unique. Further restrictions, including pedeatrian use will desroy an already struggling beach economy. In conclusion,it makes no sense to continue to waste so much of the taxpayers money to radically protect a species that is not indigeneous to the area and is not threatened by humans.Do not prohibit man from enjoying what God has given us! Joseph A. Skibinski

Correspondence ID: 13407 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 06:23:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Strongly object to the adoption of the proposed ORV management plan.
 Given the economic conditions we are currently in I am objecting to the NEGATIVE impact this proposal will have on the seasonal economy here.. The timing of this project could not come at a worse time and needs to be overhauled and reconsidered if not totally scrapped..
 The waste of taxpayer money has gone far enough on this proposal. Your assesmant of minimal impact is ridiculous .. THINK AGAIN !!!
 Steve Gnyra

Correspondence ID: 13408 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wamsley, James
Received: May,11,2010 06:26:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the ORV prohibitions on P 97-101. The privelege of beach driving is integral to the economy and cultural lifestyle of Hatteras Island. The unique makeup of tourism and resident locals requires the beaches to remain a viable means of transpotation to fishing and surfing. No adequate beach access to these remote areas will remain.
 I disagree with the closure limits for Piping Plovers and Oystercatchers on P. 121-127. 1000 meter and 300 meter (respective) closures are overly restrictive, and encourage disobediance due to the overly broad closure diameter. A more thoughtful closure area would leave enough portions of the beach available such that ORV drivers and, more importantly pedestrians, would obey the rules.
 I disagree with the night driving prohibitions on P 104. Night driving is a method to reach the beach fishing areas for early surf fishing and is a method to return from the beach after evening surfing. Typically, the ORV driver associated with morning and evening driving is not the occasional user and is skilled in negotiating closures. Perhaps this can be tempered with a requirement for a beach driving permit, which includes revenue generation for enhanced signage, and education components.
 I disagree with the prohibition of pets on P 136. The cultural impact to visitors and residents will be detrimental to the local economy as well as having a negative impact on the preservation of cultural resources.

I disagree with the statement on P 383 that the restrictions will have negligible impact. At the least, the impact will be moderate, and the cultural resources of Hatteras Island should be further studied. It appears the importance of ORV access is grossly understated in the report. Hatteras Island provides an area where the housing can remain relatively residential, as opposed to large beachfront structures. This is mainly due to preservation of beach access. The typical resident or visitor can access areas by vehicle, eliminating the need for cumbersome, environmentally unfriendly infrastructure (parking lots, beachfront hotels and condos). If this access is limited, it may ultimately result in a much greater environmental impact as large visitor infrastructure is constructed.

Correspondence ID: 13409 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 06:27:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: We have been traveling to the Outer Banks for 25 years. We have driven on the beaches (where legal) from Corolla to Cape Hatteras. It has been a privilege to use and visit this wonderful area. In those 25 years, we've seen hundreds of people enjoying and respecting their access to the beach. I've never seen anyone damaging the dunes or hurting wildlife. If I would have seen someone - I would have immediately reported them to the authorities. The park management has done an excellent job of monitoring access and protecting the beach environment and the visitors I have witnessed respect the beach and the natural environment.
 Please continue to let people visit the beaches.
 Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13410 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 06:28:08

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Subject: My comments on the DEIS / Posted by: Frank Folb Sr / 05/10/10

May 11, 2010

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

Mr. Murray:

Please accept this letter with my comments on the DEIS for Off Road Management within Cape Hatteras National Seashore, due in your office by May 11, 2010.

#1: I feel that the data contained in the "Potomac protocols" is flawed and should not be used as "best available science". In my comments at the final public comment period during reg-neg, I asked you to please use good, peer-reviewed science in considering buffer/closure distances in the new plan (DEIS). By using the 1000 meter closure/buffer distance in the DEIS I can see that my request was ignored. The Potomac Protocols have NOT been properly peer reviewed, at least not peer-reviewed properly according to USGS peer-review protocols. They are at best opinion, recommendations and conjuncture "peer-reviewed" by many of the same folks who contributed to the document. It's time this document (and the Voegslong study for that matter) were PROPERLY peer-reviewed by INDEPENDENT scientists & experts with no stake in the process IF it's going to be used as "best available" science.

#2: Buffer Distances for Birds are More Restrictive than in Other National Seashores. Piping Plovers: Cape Hatteras National Seashore (CHNS) is on the edge of the territory these birds frequent to nest and winter. CHNS is known for its turbulent weather that accounts for poor survival of Plovers on this seashore. Predators are the primary reason the success rate is poor. NPS has been very ineffective in the management of the nesting areas for many years making them predator friendly and bird unfriendly. Had these areas been maintained or included in the alternatives of management in the future, Oregon Inlet, Cape Point, both spits of Hatteras Inlet and South point of Ocracoke could have been made bird paradises that would have helped the success of nest survival. However, that out of the box NRC suggestion, supported by both access and environmental groups, was listed in the DEIS as being not suitable.

Experts speaking at the NRC meetings stated that the Piping Plover population has been rebounding in most all other locations, but population growth has not happened at CHNS. Vehicles are not shown in science to be the cause of their struggle to flourish in this seashore; storms and predations have been the problem.

Buffers in the Alternatives for piping plover are extreme and unnecessary. With the immense NPS monitoring given to these few nesting birds, much smaller, judgment (risk based) based, flexible buffers could and should be put in place upon hatching to afford chick survival while at the same time allowing reasonable public access. Only on very rare occasions have chicks been observed to travel 1000 meters, and when that has happened they were moving to a food source where they stayed until fledging, thus requiring a much smaller buffer. Several published studies show that on average, chicks move about 200 meters. My comparison to this outlandish 1000 meter buffer is that if you have a food source and a foraging plover on the bow an aircraft carrier (330 yd. long) and the crew and Navy band on the stern singing and playing "Anchors Away," the piping plover chick could care less. And that distance is one third the buffer you want to put in this plan.

AMOYS: AMOYS are on a North Carolina list of concern. By being placed on this list, North Carolina is monitoring and counting birds in a very limited fashion, but doing otherwise nothing to protect them. USFW does no enclosures in Pea Island Wildlife Refuge until an egg is laid. The management procedure is to "approach AMOY until it flushes then back away 15 yards for the closure." No more than this procedure should be used in the NPS area, keeping in mind that this is a recreational area first and a resource area second. If you state that you have only the Endanger Species Act (ESA) to go by for protecting a bird that is only on a list of concern in North Carolina, then either give it no protection or have regulations that are similar to the state procedures.

Colonial Waterbirds: The management procedures should be the same as the AMOY protection.

#3: Threatened and Endangered Sea Turtles: I refer you to the 210 page document being entered into these comments by OBPA, Larry Hardham and Bob Davis (<http://www.obpa-nc.org/turtles/TurtleMgmtProgram.pdf>) for what is the real science of turtles on this seashore. This document should and will be submitted for open, non-biased, scientific review. It holds the facts of turtle management needs on this seashore. The buffers and requirements of the present turtle management program are profoundly flawed and must be addresses. If only the management were similar to that of the USFW buffers and enclosures of Pea Island the alternatives would be different than those presented in the DEIS. We have 70+/- miles of seashore on which turtles nest or make false crawls. In the most turtle active years we have had approximately 210 totals for the year. If you divide the 70 miles into the 210 crawls and nests you will have 3 nests or crawls per mile in the May 1 to September 15 window with no night driving. And we must not forget that much of the beach is closed during this period for village closures and bird closures where the turtles do still nest and crawl. With these statistics, and nowhere in any other data, one cannot find facts or suggestions that vehicles have had large encounters with turtles or have caused deaths of turtles. Nowhere do data indicate or suggest that any nighttime closure is warranted.

Your alternatives want nests moved only for imminent danger to storms, but make no attempt to enhance or preserve recreational opportunities in high use areas in the recreational seashore. You are again misusing resource protection at the expense of recreational needs.

Nest enclosures should be no more than 10x10 and the through to the ocean no more than 18 inches wide. They should be set up in the evening and removed in the morning as done in the USFW Pea Island Refuge. Excessive enclosures are not helping the turtles. They only reduce visitor experiences.

#4: Year Round Closures Year round closures in a dynamic weather related seashore is unacceptable and wrong. If the spits and Cape Point were made to be "bird" friendly and not predator friendly there would be no need for the beach front closures anywhere on the seashore. Poor past management practice should not be accepted in this plan as unfixable. Seasonal village closures, safety closures, the accepted closure of the beach in front of the light house and jetties should be the only closures for those wanting pedestrian only areas. While no one in the access coalition wants year round beach access for vehicle in front of the villages, we do believe that those areas should be open in the off season from Sept. 15 to May 15, as has been the practice until this time. Political closures have been in place in Frisco and Hatteras for several years, essentially privatizing those ocean fronts almost entirely for the owners of those cottages. This is wrong and in my eyes illegal.

#5: Socioeconomic Impact is Incomplete NPS is using incomplete data and analysis to reach economic impact conclusions in the DEIS. Due to a hasty,

under budgeted, and limited data collection and analysis process, there is no completed or peer reviewed economic analysis. This makes the DEIS seriously flawed and an illegal component of the DEIS. I have had to reduce employees and now at a time that I have reached an age when I want to spend less time in my business and more time enjoying old age. The present consent decree has forced me to work most every day and employ less people. Alternative F will provide no relief. The impact has been, and will continue to be, a major loss for my business.

#6: Pets Your preferred alternative has disallowed pets within the entire seashore from March 15 until July 31. We all agree that pets should be on a leash on the beach, but to punish the people who obey the leash law by prohibiting all pets is unacceptable. Nowhere has anyone from NPS checked with the rental agencies in the villages within the seashore to see the amount of increase in the number of "pet friendly" houses over the last few years. This new regulation prohibiting pets, completely unrelated to ORV management, will result in families staying away.

#7: The DEIS is flawed and illegal The NPS 6 alternatives begin with Alternative A ? No Action plan and Alternative B ? No action plan. Both of these plans were the result of actions. Alternative A was the result of the interim plan being put in place and Alternative B was put in place by the consent decree. Because the DEIS should have had a Alternative No Action plan that reflected the regulations being enforced in 2004 that were adopted from the 1978 draft plan and updates through Superintendents compendiums, I contend that the entire DEIS is flawed and illegal.

I respectfully submit that you have no option but to put the "Coalition for Beach Access" position statement in place as the new ORV plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It is the only acceptable and practical management alternative for a recreational area, Cape Hatteras National Seashore, the first in the nation

Sincerely,
Michael M. Stokes

Correspondence ID: 13411 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Schultz, Hugh K

Received: May,11,2010 06:28:34

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

I have been going to the Outer Banks since 1970. My first trip was a surf fishing expedition that took place in April. I have made that same trip almost every year up until last year. I was unable to access my favorite surf fishing beach so I opted to stay home. I usually rent a house, buy food, go out to breakfast, lunch and dinner, buy gas, charter a boat, buy fishing tackle, buy bait, buy gifts, and buy a licence (which is ridiculous because it is federal water and we all own that). I'm not sure if I'm the only person that feels strongly enough to stay home, but I'll take a wild stab at a guess that I'm not alone??? It's called National Seashore Recreational Area not Wildlife Sanctuary. I'm certainly not opposed to sharing the beach with the birds but I'll be damned if I will give it up to them without a fight. I manufacture fishing lures, (part time), and sales have fallen off in North Carolina. I am a full time teacher and I'm not afraid to explain the situation to students who also travel to North Carolina to vacation!! I realize I'm typing in vain but at least I can read this and feel I have done my part. Sincerely Hugh Schultz

Correspondence ID: 13412 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13413 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: DeMumbrum, Jack E

Received: May,11,2010 06:29:56

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

As a frequent visitor, I support the idea of maintaining open beach access. Dollars already available to support wildlife should be used more wisely to maintain wildlife. Additional dollars can be raised through contributions from visitors like myself. Discontinue beach access and visitation along with home values will drop significantly, thereby reducing the flow of funds available to maintain wildlife. People have rights too. Maintain beach access.

Correspondence ID: 13414 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 06:31:22

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954

Re: Comment Draft Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement--DEIS

The DEIS describes the NPS preferred alternative in the following fashion:

Alternative F ? Management Based on Advisory Committee Input. Alternative F is the National Park Service Preferred Alternative. The NPS used the Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee's Cape Hatteras National Seashore input to create this action alternative, which is designed to provide visitors to the Seashore with a wide variety of access opportunities for both ORV and pedestrian users.(p. xi)

I do not agree Alternative F that reflects the work of the Advisory Committee.

Stated more specifically, Alternative F is not a committee based proposal and it should not be labeled as such. This statement is based upon the final report from the facilitators. In this report, the facilitators note that the advisory committee failed to come to agreement on any aspect of park management. In fact, the positions held by stakeholders were so diametrically opposed to one another that the facilitators didn't even try to summarize the advisory committee's work. Instead, the facilitators simply transmitted 6 addendums ranging from 20 to nearly 1,500 pages each. In sharp contrast the NPS selects elements from the addendums submitted by the 6 groups and combines the elements in ways the groups never intended. Even more offensive is the fact that the NPS recently denied a request for an extension of the comment period because Alternative F is based upon advisory committee recommendations previously published for public review.

Correspondence ID: 13415 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Pierce, Christopher A
Received: May,11,2010 06:31:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Christopher Pierce 26229 Wimble Shores Drive Salvo, NC 27972 May 10, 2010
Mike Murray Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Mr. Murray: First let me say, thank you. I can't imagine how hard this conflict must be on you and those that are close to you. What used to be so simple has become so complicated. What started out as protecting wildlife has become far greater reaching. It is amazing how much those that desire more laws can complicate things that are relatively easy.
MANAGEMENT METHODOLOGY ? Identify criteria to designate ORV use areas and routes. ? Establish ORV management practices and procedures that have the ability to adapt in response to changes in the Seashore's dynamic physical and biological environment. ? Establish a civic engagement component for ORV management. ? Establish procedures for prompt and efficient public notification of beach access status including any temporary ORV use restrictions for such things as ramp maintenance, resource and public safety closures, storm events, etc. ? Build stewardship through public awareness and understanding of NPS resource management and visitor use policies and responsibilities as they pertain to the Seashore and ORV management.
How did we and the hundreds of animal species survive for the past 75 years of beach driving without all these management practices?
Personally I understand the need to protect wildlife (especially those endangered), but I don't understand why most beach access to ORV was shut down for so long last summer especially when I read about so few animals that are being protected. I know you understand animals and how adaptive they are and always will be. I really don't understand why we are using so many resources to change what has been historically acceptable, desirable and manageable. Roping off the turtle nests with a driving lane to one side or the other has been effective all around the world. The birds will nest in areas of lesser human activity, so why not give them set areas of a mile or two every several miles without blocking the main driving accesses. As a home owner just 8 lots from the beach you would think it would be easy for me to get to the beach. I have an 11 month old son and a 2 = year old daughter whom require a lot of stuff. Driving on the beach is the best way for my family to enjoy the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Furthermore, I am an avid sportsman; I very much enjoy all the activities of a beach lifestyle. It was on the Cape Hatteras National seashore that I caught my first wave, caught my first fish, flew my first kite, and so many other memories. It is the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that I am happy you are here to protect. This is the place I want to teach my children to enjoy all the wonderful gifts God has given us that are free. On many occasions last summer my wife and I packed up our truck with all the usual beach gear loaded our children in and set off to the beach; sometimes we drove and drove and drove and never found an open beach to drive on, to be fair, we did not go all the way to Frisco.
One last thought, conflicting viewpoints are expected on this issue, and as long as they are fairly well balanced (as they have been), I feel that the issue is encouraging people to think more intelligently and deeply about the wildlife and the environment they want to preserve. Residents like I do not want to see any beach closures because it has and will continue to affect the economy. More education and thought go a long way, through this process I think people have become more educated, give them a chance to prove it. We don't need more regulation we need more thoughtful citizens who want to do the right thing.
Thank you for taking the time to read my opinions. I hope you will continue to look for ways to keep all the beach accesses open, the main surfing breaks open and protect the birds and turtles without too many regulations. I also wish you peace with whatever transpires. Sincerely,
Christopher Pierce

Correspondence ID: 13416 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Higham, James J
Received: May,11,2010 06:34:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: -----START QUOTE----- Dr Michael A. Berry -----
April 27, 2010
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Comments on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore ORV Management Plan DEIS I wish to thank the National Park Service for an opportunity to comment on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore ORV Management Plan DEIS. As a concerned citizen, scientist, retired public administrator and university educator, I feel it is my professional and civic duty to make timely comment on a matter that affects thousands of citizens who wish to visit and have access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
For the record, I have a broad public service, technical, and scientific background. I have in-depth knowledge of environmental sciences, research methods, and review procedures, especially those related to human health. I have basic knowledge of the federal environmental statutes and programs, and many years of firsthand experience with federal environmental policy-making processes. I hold the following degrees: Doctor of Philosophy in Public Health with a specialty in environmental management and protection from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; Master of Science in Management from Duke University's Fuqua School of Business; both Bachelor and Master of Science degrees in Mathematics from Gonzaga University. I am a retired Lieutenant Colonel, Army Engineers and a combat veteran of the Viet Nam War. I have from time to time advised the Chief of Army Engineers and Under Secretary of Defense for Environment on a range of environmental issues, projects, and policies. In my civilian life, I retired from the US Environmental Protection Agency in 1998 after a 27-year career with that agency. For over 22 years, I served as the Deputy Director of the National Center for Environmental Assessment at Research Triangle Park, NC. During my EPA career I had extensive interactions with foreign, state, and local governments; federal environmental agencies and offices; the federal courts; US Congress; universities world-wide; institutions to include the National Academy of Sciences, the World Health Organization, and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; the major environmental organizations; private industry and trade associations. For more than 20 years, I was either an adjunct or full-time faculty member at the University of North Carolina where I taught environmental science and management courses in the Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, the Kenan-Flagler Business School, and Environmental Studies Program.
I wish to state clearly for the public record that I have been for the past four decades and remain today and forever in the future, professionally committed to protection of the environment. I am primarily concerned with environmental conditions that affect the health and well-being of humans and with the conservation of natural resources that are essential components of a healthy environment. Given the ever changing environmental conditions brought about by growing human populations and expanding regional and global economies, effective environmental management is more essential now than ever before, but never at the expense of violating human and Constitutional rights of citizens.
I reside at - - - - - , North Carolina. I can be contacted with regard to these comments at drmikeberry@gmail.com.
Comment 1 There is a clear need for an equitable, balanced, and effective seashore access policy and management plan. Growing national population, seashore visitation, transportation avenues into the Outer Banks region mandates an access management policy?but one which has widespread public support and one that balances the rights and traditions of public use and access to the national seashore with responsible but reasonable resource protection.
As currently structured, Alternative F is not primarily an ORV management plan. It is primarily a public access restriction plan. The plan is biased toward bird and turtle protection, seashore isolation and not to a reasonable extent on public use and visitor access??specifically ORV and pedestrian access.
Responsible environmental management uses sound science and unbiased professional judgment that balances the human needs and rights of people with the needs to manage and sustain natural processes. The preferred proposal, Alternative F, fails to meet these criteria. Alternative F fails to recognize objective science, enabling legislation, citizen rights, historical uses, and past promises of access to their environment.
Promulgation of Alternative F as it is currently structured will be the basis for widespread public dissatisfaction, continued distrust of government, especially the National Park Service, and costly litigation.
Comment 2 As indicated by Alternative F, it is the intention of National Park Service (NPS) to transform a major part of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area?set aside over 70 years ago for use and enjoyment of American citizens?into a wildlife sanctuary, predominantly a national

bird and turtle use area. NPS is using as its justification for this radical transformation and departure from traditional and intended public use, a thirty-five year old executive order directing NPS to formally promulgate an ORV management plan.

Alternative F management plan, with its excessive restrictions and denial of public access, both pedestrian and ORV, is in large part incompatible with the legislative purpose and intent of why the national seashore was established (16USC459 CHNSRA Enabling Legislation):

"said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area."

Nowhere is it indicated in the DEIS where enabling legislation intends or permits both pedestrian and vehicular access denial for a major part of the year, particularly visitor or vacation season.

Comment 3 NPS Request for public comment appears to be more of a bureaucratic process than a search for substantive decision-making information. By virtue of its massive size, complexity, biased and incomplete explanation of science, and the inability for members of the public to access cited scientific literature and references, and ask questions of government officials responsible for the science and DEIS content, no single citizen can effectively review, understand, and constructively comment or suggest improvement to the DEIS in the 60 day comment period.

It appears by way of emphasis in the discussion in the DEIS that NPS has every intention to promulgate Alternative F in the next year, regardless of past or present public comment. There is virtually no significant reference to the workbooks the public provided in the early stages of the plan development process or to countless constructive comments made by the public during the 15 month Regulation Negotiation Process.

The National Park Service (NPS) should make it known to the public the specific information it seeks so as to make a final, objective decision with regard to an ORV management plan for Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore Recreational Area. Thus far NPS has failed to do so. By not asking for specific information, NPS is simply "going through the motions" superficially, and wasting the public's time.

Comment 4 NPS presents Alternative F as if it were recommended by the recent Regulatory Negotiation process. However, upon close examination Alternative F is found to be a biased and highly restrictive management plan that is in complete opposition to majority recommendations of the recent Regulation Negotiation process. Alternative F strengthens and codifies the denial of public access provisions of the current consent decree. The public access denying provisions of the consent decree, put into effect April 30, 2008, have been extended and transferred to Alternative F. The majority of Regulatory Negotiation Committee stakeholders (19 vs. 5) and numerous public commentators did not recommend an extension of the restrictive provisions of the consent decree as part of a final ORV plan.

Comment 5 If promulgated, Alternative F will significantly change the economy and unique culture of the Outer Banks. The DEIS has failed to properly assess those changes. The Economic Impact Analysis found the DEIS by its own admission is incomplete. This alone is the basis for future litigation challenging the legality of the proposed plan. In addition the Economic analysis is structured in such a manner that it fails to address full costs?direct costs, indirect costs, lost opportunity costs, costs of future liability, and hidden costs.

The Economic Analysis fails to recognize that the national seashore environment is a unique form of capital that serves the local economy, and in turn the health and wellbeing of citizens and families that depend of that economy. Access to the seashore is essential for family business operations on the Outer Banks.

The cost to society and the local communities under the restrictive consent decree has now been extended indefinitely into Alternative F. Economic losses in millions of dollars have occurred to island businesses especially motels, campgrounds, restaurants and tackle shops. The full costs of Alternative F are very much understated in the DEIS. Annual economic losses under the consent decree are already in excess of those estimated by Research Triangle Institute.

Comment 6 The DEIS has failed to inform the public of the extent of expected closures to the most popular recreational sites of the national seashore. Experience with the consent decree closures for the past two years (2008, 2009) provide a clear indication of the extent to which the national seashore will be closed to public access?ORV and pedestrian. In recent court testimony the National Seashore Superintendent indicated the extent of the closures, but nowhere does that data appear in the DEIS. The public should know what to expect when Alternative F is promulgated.

The Bodie Island Spit was closed a total of 136 days in 2009. Cape Point was closed 101 days in 2009. The Hatteras Island Spit was closed 125 days and south Ocracoke was closed 80 days. These are some of the most popular recreational use areas at the national seashore which will not be accessible to the public during late spring and summer months.

Comment 7 Nowhere in the DEIS is it indicated that should listed species populations grow in size through natural population cycles or management programs, the public loses even more access given the way the boundary distance are applied.

Comment 8 Nowhere in the DEIS is it mentioned that protected species populations are growing without the needs of additional restrictions such as those of consent decree and Alternative F.

Published USFWS data suggests that the piping plover is "recovering" well beyond 1986 levels and do not suggest that additional restrictions beyond regional recovery plans are necessary or essential at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area for the continued recovery of the species.

Piping Plover--Atlantic Coast Pairs

Year 1986 1999 2005 2006 2007 Nesting Pairs (est.) 790 1386 1632 1749 1880

<http://www.fws.gov/northeast/pipingplover/index.html>

Comment 9 Data collected and published by NPS in recent suggest that Cape Hatteras National Seashore Interim Management Plan prepared with public input and publically reviewed in 2005, published in the Federal Register was showing every sign of being effective at protecting birds and natural resources. The Interim Management Plan was set aside by the court and replaced by the consent decree and settlement that mandated extensive closures without public comment or review.

The consent decree closures of recent years have been of exorbitantly high cost to the public but have not contributed to an improvement in species production or safety. The consent decree has produced no natural resource benefit over and above the interim plan. The fledge counts were higher under the interim plan than under the consent decree. 7 Piping Plovers fledged in 2008 under the interim plan, 6 in 2009 under the highly restrictive consent decree. 17 American Oyster Catchers (AMOY) fledged in 2008 under the interim plan and 13 in 2009 under the highly access restrictive consent decree, the same management structure now found in Alternative F. Species productivity is decreasing under consent decree and now Alternative F restrictions.

Comment 10 The majority of nests and hatched birds the past two closure seasons under the consent decree were lost to predation, a few to storms, one at the hands of a university researcher trying to band a bird. None has been lost to ORVs or pedestrians accessing the national seashore. The huge closure distances in the consent decree and Alternative F restrictions keep pedestrians and ORVs off the seashore while birds are nesting. At the same time, the extensive closures also provide for the proliferation and increased free movement of predators. In effect, the extensive closures create an ecological trap for birds in large closures that encourage and enhance predation.

Comment 11 When the boundary distances shown on Table 11 are applied to the Alternative F framework, it is evident that the public, ORV and pedestrian, lose access to a vast amount of the seashore for most of the visitor season. Closure boundaries are overly restrictive at CHNSRA and are not used at other NPS properties. There has been no administrative or science based explanation given to the public for these especially restrictive closures that limit public access to the seashore.

NPS has failed to explain specifically why, by way of science justification, 1000 meter boundaries must be established every time a Plover chick is observed, where the literature indicates on average movement under 200 meters. There is no study or science based explanation that justifies an automatic 1000 meter boundary closure every time a plover chick is observed. In fact the public access denial consequences of such management policy for a national seashore set aside for public use is excessive and does not indicate a balance of responsible usage.

If, as the Alternative F regulation dictates, one extends a boundary out 1000m in every direction from a nest, one creates a circle with a boundary circumference of approximately 3.9 miles, and an area of approximately 1.2 square miles or approximately 775 acres. Given that the boundary regulation dictates 775 acres of national seashore be set aside for the exclusive use of a plover chick?during the height of vacation and visitor season, it obviously does not take too many widely distributed plover chicks to shut down a significant portion of Cape Hatters National Seashore Recreational Area especially if the Plover population increases.

Comment 12 Alternative F, as with the consent decree, establishes a policy of denial of access punishment for the general public when intrusions into closure areas occur. Every time there is a closure intrusion the National Park Service, now at its own discretion, extends restrictive boundaries and widens non-access areas. There is no basis in science or environmental management practices that justifies such punitive measures.

Comment 13 Many of the references used to justify Alternative F are those of individuals and activists organizations who have supported litigation that denies public access. The major science references are published by environmental activist organizations and authored by individuals trying to shut

down ORV access to the national seashore: Audubon, Blue Water, Hatteras Island Bird Club, etc. Most of these references have not been reviewed for their accuracy or objectivity and are unsuitable for government decision-making. Many of the references are out dated, biased, contain incomplete and misleading information, and few have ever been reviewed in open forum.

Comment 14 NPS has failed to provide the public with essential items of information, specifically properly reviewed science. The main science references are unsuitable and inappropriate as the basis for a government regulation that restricts public access to the national seashore and has significant negative impacts on the Outer Banks economy.

The 2005 USGS Protocols are indicated by NPS as the primary basis for the highly restrictive boundary distances that restrict public access to the national seashore. The USGS Protocols are cited as being "in press" 5 years after they first appeared on the Park Service website. The 2005 USGS Protocols were challenged two years ago as being in non compliance with USGS Peer Review Policy. At that time the documents were not dated, had no government publication number, and were not published in the open literature or Federal Register and were clearly unsuitable to be a credible scientific basis for government decision-making, especially costly regulation. The documents were sent back to USGS for "review" in 2009, five years after they were first made known to the public.

NPS has indicated a new citation for the USGS Protocols. They are currently referenced on page 660 as: Cohen, J.B., R.M. Erwin, J.B. French Jr., J.L. Marion, and J.M. Meyers In press, Recommendations for Management of Endangered Species at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2009-1262.

NPS uses the USGS protocol recommendations as if they are "best available science." They are not science and have not been shown to be connected with specific scientific studies. The management options presented in the protocols are the policy and management recommendations and opinions of biased and non-reviewed contributors, deemed by USGS to the "experts." Nowhere is a specific science basis (study, data) for a given management option established solely for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area demonstrated.

In a slightly modified introduction to the most recent release of the Protocols, the government official responsible for the document states: "Although no new original research or experimental work was conducted, this synthesis of the existing information was peer reviewed by over 15 experts with familiarity with these species. This report does not establish NPS management protocols but does highlight scientific information on the biology of these species to be considered by NPS managers who make resource management decisions at CAHA."

The new publication was not accessible, peer reviewed, or fully explained by government authority at the time the DEIS was submitted to the public for comment in early March 2010.

The literature reviews found in the USGS Protocols as currently published are significantly out of date. In fact many studies were decades out of date at the time the document was prepared in 2005. They are mainly non-replicated, selective papers and studies. Many citations are over 20 years old and most are not related to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. The public does not have access to the literature reviewed in this essential report and most of the citations are so insignificant they cannot even be found in a major university library (UNC-CH).

Comment 15 There is an "appearance of impropriety" and "conflict of interest" associated with the primary science basis justification for the Alternative F recommendation.

As noted two years ago, the cited protocols are not reviewed consistent with published USGS peer review policy guidelines (<http://www.usgs.gov/usgs-manual/500/502-3.html>) especially with regard to full disclosures and conflicts of interests. In fact the Protocols were developed and prepared in large part by well known environmental activists who subsequently used them as the basis for law suit against NPS, thus creating a very clear conflict of interest in full view of the federal government.

A review of the public record indicates that USGS commissioned well known environmental activist scientists to selectively review and discuss the science as they choose to represent it, and then formulate and recommend management options and policies. There was no outside questioning and review of their work--paid for by federal tax dollars.

It is clear to those of us who understand the scientific methods and process, objective scientific review, and the internal workings of federal government, that the 2004-2005 cooperative agreement review of the science (undertaken in part by members of the Audubon Society and other activist organizations) is biased and selective, misrepresented, fraught with speculation and opinion, and in many cases based on information that has nothing whatsoever to do with Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

In 2005 the architects of the access denying protocols were acknowledged for their contributions. For nearly three years now we have asked NPS and USGS to identify the "independent outside reviewers" of the USGS Protocols consistent with USGS Peer Review Policy. We are now being informed by USGS through their press office that the "science peer reviewers" are the original contributors and architects of the Protocols (which are not science at all, but policy and management opinions/recommendations that regulate the public and deny public access to the national seashore). We are also being informed by press officials that it is the policy of USGS to not identify outside independent peer reviewers or their comments. This is a violation of the Freedom of Information Act and the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

Some of the original contributors (Cohen and Golder) have used the Protocols to be the basis for litigation and insist on denial of public access to the seashore. A lead author "J.B. Cohen" has previously shown his conflict of interest and activist affiliation when he "J.B. Cohen" signed a sworn affidavit in support of the Consent Decree for SELC (2008) and also signed the recent Audubon letter directed at NPS Officials recommending the highest level of access restriction (2009). Scientists working on behalf of the public cannot turn around and use that same work to sue to public without having the objectivity of their work called into question.

For over 15 months of Regulation Negotiation Process, Golder, other environmental activist members, and the federal government never disclosed participants' roles in the design of the Protocols, but constantly referred to them as being the definitive "best available science" justification for closures. Golder and others now appear as "peer reviewers" of their own work. This is discrediting in and of itself, but what is most disturbing and unethical about this is the fact that this highly biased, pseudo science process, sponsored by the federal government, has denied thousands of citizens access to their national seashore and will continue to do so unless it corrected by NPS, the federal courts, or the congress.

The above is clearly a "apparent conflict of interest" known to NPS and USGS officials and calls into question the credibility of science which in the public policy making process specifically that of denying public access to the national seashore must be "objective" beyond any doubt. Local media have noted this "apparent conflict of interest" and brought it to the attention of NPS and USGS officials who refuse to offer an explanation or response. The best course of action to resolve this matter is to turn the science review and update over the National Academy of Sciences or some other neutral party, to objectively, critically, and comprehensively review all relevant science, disclose the facts and restore some public trust in the scientific process used as the basis for environmental management decisions at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Respectfully Submitted

Michael A. Berry ----END QUOTE-----

In closing I would like to state that this quote from Dr. Mike Berry is stated much more eloquently than I could. I support this statement fully and hope the NPS can see the light that this man has shown to NPS. I support no-action Alternative A as amended with my suggestions in my previous comments.

Correspondence ID: 13417 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 06:39:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Beach access by SUV's on the beach will protect the wildlife that nest in the dunes, if the fishermen have to walk to the fishing areas they will disrupt the wildlife/nesting birds and also damage the dunes. The area where the SUV's drive is on the sand near the water line which is firmer because of the wave action and would not have any nesting going on.

Correspondence ID: 13418 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Downs, Edward J
Received: May,11,2010 06:48:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have lived and worked on Hatteras Island since 1979.

This Government Process is harming those people that live and work on the island.
 This process should be concerned with the Human Beings that live on the island.
 As much as you try you will not be able to legislate nature.
 Edward Jay Downs M.D.

Correspondence ID: 13419 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 06:51:29
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: 13420 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 06:51:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern,
 I absolutely disagree with the proposed Draft Environmental Impact Statement alternative F.
 This proposal will have significant impacts on all small businesses on Hatteras Island as well as tremendous negative impacts to cottage owners due to significant decreases in rental incomes as a result of beach closures!
 The soul reason Hatteras Island has been so popular historically over this last half century is due to the open beach access which allows freedom for people to enjoy fishing, easy access for handicapped visitors, and the enjoyment of families with thier pets.
 This is what makes Hatteras Island so very unique and to take this away from visitors and land owners who have enjoyed this experience over the years will be an extreme injustice to all.
 The lands and oceanfronts extending from the Oregon Inlet bridge to Rodanthe should be more than sufficient for the inhabitants of wild life and their existence not to mention the 10 miles of land from Salvo to Avon.
 Please do not consider this alternative as an option since it will take away the FREEDOM that we all enjoy!!!!

Correspondence ID: 13421 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Following are my suggested improvements to the ORV DEIS.
 1. Commercial fishing vehicles have already their own permits (xxx, 325), and given their long history on the ocean beach (19), I believe they should be give corridors through resource closures.(viii,xi) The ramps were originally created for them (20). That commercial fishermen are not given corridors through resource closures is inconsistent with their being allowed through safety closures (xxi) and having more night driving time (xxx). Some might say this is special treatment, and I agree (53). I disagree with the statement that they are non-essential vehicles (xxx). They provide food for our people. There could at least have been a definition of essential vehicle given in the DEIS, instead of referring the reader to a piping plover document. That definitely shows that plovers are rated above the descendants of the original people that settled these islands (325). Even the ESA recognizes that a long history of species coexisting together is evidence that one is no great harm to the other. This is why Alaskan natives are exempt. The piping plover is not even endangered. Moreover, page 327 of the DEIS says:
 "Commercial fish harvesting would have negligible impact on piping plovers because plovers do not feed on any commercially important fish. However, plovers do feed on some of the same prey items of fish species that may be harvested and, as such, harvest of fish may mean greater prey encounters for plovers. In this case, the impact of commercial fishing could result in long-term minor to moderate increases in prey availability that would have a beneficial impact on piping plover foraging."
 This statement is inconsistent with commercial fishermen not being allowed corridors through resource closures.
 2. A buffer with 1,000 meters diameter could cover all private land on Ocracoke Island (121-127). Thus it is not a buffer, but just a more politically correct way of saying "no access".
 3. Much was made of the fact that of that of US National Seashores only Cape Hatteras has seen a decline in piping plover numbers in recent years (121-127). There has also been an increase in ORV use. Every scientist knows that "correlation does not necessarily imply causation". The Pamlico Sound area is very large and unique in the US. They are many other places immediately outside the seashore that are good bird habitat. This may not be true to such an extent for the other seashores. There should be a study of how this factor might figure into bird counts.

Correspondence ID: 13422 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 06:52:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please, please go back to the interim plan that was originally established and worked for years. These new options severely limit the access of beach access to Hatteras Island's most popular areas, hurting our tourism industry and taking away some of the nicest beaches from the folks who live, play

and work here, and who have respected the beach for generations. Do not let national organizations and people who do not know our hometowns dictate how they should be run.

Correspondence ID: 13423 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Morris, Kathleen S
Received: May,11,2010 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: 13424 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Ferrar, Erik
Received: May,11,2010 06:52:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Remember the line in the song that we sang in grade school "this land was made for you and me"?
How about living up to what was taught to us as children?
Sincerely,
Erik Ferrar US Citizen/Taxpayer

Correspondence ID: 13425 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Swartz, Dolores A
Received: May,11,2010 06:55:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Important Development
"Species of Concern" clarified by NCWRC's Gordon Myers
For a long time, beach access advocates have urged the National Park Service not to extend protection to non-endangered birds as if they were endangered.
The Park Service has given large buffers to non-endangered birds such as American oystercatchers citing the fact that they appear on a list of North Carolina's "species of concern."
In the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), the Park Service's preferred Alternative F would continue to give protection to non-endangered birds. This has drawn a reaction from Gordon Myers, the Executive Director of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, who claims this practice is beyond the intent of the state of North Carolina.
Following is an excerpt from a May 9, 2010 Virginian-Pilot news article by Catherine Kozak: Numerous shorebirds in Cape Hatteras National Seashore are given higher levels of protection in a proposed off-road vehicle management plan than what the law ever intended the birds to have, a state wildlife official said.
State-listed "species of concern," - such as the American oystercatcher - do not require the extensive buffers and beach closures mandated for federally listed species such as the piping plover, said Gordon Myers, the executive director of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission. Myers said that's beyond the intent of the state law: the state designation is supposed to be more of a call to action for a species.
The Wildlife Resource Commission, he said, will voice its objections to the use of state "species of concern" lists to trigger ORV management strategies under the federal Endangered Species Act.
That is of concern to us because it's apples and oranges," he said. "To treat it as synonymous with threatened and endangered is not congruent."
I strongly agree that this published comment by the NCWRF should be used when writing the final EIS that will manage MY HOME for the next decade.
Dolores Swartz 42187 Shallow Point Drive PO Box 336 Avon NC 27915 SweetadOBX@aol.com 252 995 6388

Correspondence ID: 13426 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 06:56:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The consent decree and now the NPS DEIS has undermined my trust in our government and the National Park Service. The DEIS will have dire economic affects to the island and beyond. I understand the need to protect species, but it is only valid to a certain extent. It is hard to make it financially on the island when there is a boom and everyone has money. With the economic downturn and the closing of the beaches this place may no longer be able to keep islanders in their homes. I agree with closures similar to Nags HEad for turtles and birds and free access during the off season. I also understand ORV's needing to be restricted but it is possible to regulate the amount of traffic. People can get a pass to go on the beaches and if they ever violate a law on the beach they can be restricted to driving on the beaches for 3 years. The use of detours and bypasses around the closure is the only way to make this plan work. Please go back to how it was before the consent decree.

Correspondence ID: 13427 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Barshis, Darr

Received: May,11,2010 06:57:42
 Correspondence Type: Web Form
 Correspondence: National Park Service Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area Hatteras, NC
 May, 2010

To whom it may concern; I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the Draft Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). As was mentioned in my comments in the public meeting in Buxton 4/26/10, I believe cooperation among all the parties is paramount to achieving the goals desired with these regulations. There is a delicate balance in providing reasonable access to the public for recreational purposes, and protecting resources in such a way to encourage proliferation of species, plants, and beach. I would like to first make a few points about the overall DEIS assessment, then focus on areas where change may occur. The issues on Hatteras Island are unique to any other National Park. Here, the beach is ever more important to all aspects of life. These southern village communities are surrounded by Federal lands and water. ALL activity revolves around the beaches. ALL economics depend upon an active tourist business, beach access, and a well managed beach. To include the economic statistics of northern beach communities as part of the southern beach communities is similar to including the time of the pace horse at the Kentucky Derby as part of the overall race statistics. Our adjoining northern beach community neighbors, Southern Shores, Kitty Hawk, Kill Devil Hills, and Nags Head are completely different economies. In fact, tourists (our main industry) must bypass these northern beach communities in order to get to the southern beaches. The extra half hour to hour and a half drive south makes these northern beaches more of a competitor than a companion to the southern village communities. Full time population differences alone clearly reflect the dichotomy between the southern villages and northern towns. These northern beach towns include Southern Shores (population 2,587 (2008 Dare Co.)), Kitty Hawk (population 3,260 (2008 Dare Co.)), Kill Devil Hills (population 6,642 (2005 Dare Co.)) and Nags Head (population 3,016 (2008 Dare Co.)).

The population of these northern beach communities totals 15,500 people spread across approximately 18 miles.

In comparison, the southern beach villages include Rodanthe (population 203), Waves (population 49 or 50), Salvo (population 339), Avon (population 735), Buxton (population 1,848), Hatteras Village (population 743), and Hyde County's Ocracoke Island (population 769).

The population of these southern beach communities totals 5,456 spread across approximately 65 miles (all population statistics from most recent data and most reputable sources between 2000 census and 2008 Dare County records. Mileage does not include Pea Island Wildlife Refuge nor does it include any water area across Hatteras Inlet).

When one compares revenues from the restaurant, hotel, rental cottage, and retail establishments, the economic dichotomy of these different communities becomes ever more clear. My discussions with a local seafood business owner, two local tackle shop owners, a local campground owner, guests to my rental cottage, and fishermen on the beach, indicate beach closings are confounding (and in some cases aggravating) visitors. Many are deciding not to return until all this is "figured out" (their words). Business owners are telling me they believe business is down between 17% and 38% due solely to beach closings. Many guests have responded "they love the isolation of the southern beaches". They say "if we are forced to smaller, more crowded areas of the beach, why not stop at VA Beach or Nags Head?" All visitors traveling from the north and northwest must find reason to bypass the larger beach communities of Virginia Beach and northern North Carolina to reach our southern beach communities.

Small changes in visitor perceptions about beach access have significant economic impact on southern beach communities.

Generally I agree with the conclusions of the Coalition for Beach Access DEIS Assessment. There are many areas of concern discussed in this assessment, but I will comment on 2 points I believe to be paramount to implementation of successful regulation.

Pedestrian and ORV bypass corridors should be provided thru all SMAs throughout the year.

When closures extend all the way to the water's edge, large areas of recreational beach are blocked from access. This forces the beach visitor to smaller and more densely populated areas of beach ? as mentioned, something the visitor can find in VA Beach or Nags Head. Popular beach spots of Hatteras Inlet, Cape Point (Buxton), and Ocracoke Points, are areas where nesting should not take place to begin with. These popular East Coast fishing areas are most susceptible to flood. Storm flooding accounts for approximately 30% of nesting failures. These areas flood with simply a suitable moon phase, or the slightest properly directed wind. Additionally, bypass corridors will be beneficial in helping keep predators away from nesting birds. Predators account for over 50% of nest failures. Human presence is a deterrent to predator species. Plover have not nested at Hatteras Inlet for years. Dredge Island, not included in any species management statistics, is a mere few hundred yards from Hatteras Inlet and home to many species of birds. As mentioned in my comments at the Buxton public meeting on 4/26/10, most local residents know what to do for needy animals they come upon on the beach. If there is a dangerous situation, or something needing proper equipment, they know to call NPS biologist Michelle Bogardus. I mentioned I have personally called Michelle to help at least half a dozen stranded sea turtles in the past 3 years. I know many other residents have done the same. Without access around closures we are not in position to help. It is inevitable that NPS will at some point in the future be short on resources to monitor/manage the beach. Locals become ever more important in preserving nature and our natural resources at times like this.

Bypass corridors will go a LONG WAY in appeasing tension developed by local residents and visitors in this debate. No one will be completely happy with the resulting regulation. Both sides will have issues with whatever is in the final document. From the standpoint of local residents and visitors though, both will be more able to accept the consequences of regulation if access around closures is provided.

Suggestion: NPS personnel, or trained volunteers, could monitor corridors in closure areas where there are active endangered species nests. Volunteer programs have been very successful in the past. Programs can be established/expanded to monitor existing nests/hatchlings. This is an excellent opportunity for a public/private partnership. This is also an ideal educational opportunity. An education program designed to train NPS staff and volunteer monitors to "train the public" would serve the public need and protect species. I would note visitors are always inquisitive about what is going on. They and their children can learn valuable species management lessons with this opportunity. I believe local residents would be happy to develop an educational program together with NPS staff. I believe local residents would welcome the opportunity to staff volunteers and maintain an education program on the beach.

Buffer size is also an important aspect of the regulations currently under consideration.

Our National Parks allow humans to experience the natural beauty of sensitive environments on a grand scale. Proper management practices help in preserving and encouraging sensitive species development within that environment. Protective buffers, as part of that management strategy, should be adequate to serve their intended purpose. The USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center developed an unbiased analysis specifically related to this issue. In that analysis adequate buffer sizes for protection of threatened and endangered species and species of special concern at Cape Hatteras National Seashore were established. The LARGEST recommended buffer size in that study was 200 meters. A smaller buffer size, supported by a Biological Opinion from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, details a 375 foot radius, or approximately 10 acres, as sufficient distance for protection from sight and noise disturbance for certain raptors. (USDI. 2004. Appendix 1 from: Biological opinion and letter of concurrence for effects to bald eagles, marbled murrelets, northern spotted owls, bull trout. Olympic National Forest. Lacey, Washington, August 2003, revised September 2004). Earlier scientific studies have been performed in a series of habitat suitability index (HIS) models published by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for a variety of wildlife species, including birds, mammals, reptiles, and amphibians (e.g., Raleigh, 1982; McMahon, 1983; Sousa and Farmer, 1983; Raleigh et al., 1984; Schroeder, 1984). These studies demonstrated a need for buffer widths UP TO 106.7 meters, depending on the particular resource needs of individual species. I support the Coalition for Beach Access position of moving the buffer with the brood as it relocates toward reliable food sources.

In summary, buffers sizes up to 200 meters in width, with access corridors around these buffers, satisfies the objectives of National Park Service recreational access AND meets reasonable scientifically recommended MAXIMUM buffer size to protect species.

I believe reasonable regulation, containing corridor bypasses and 200 meter movable buffers, will go a long way in obtaining cooperation and participation from local residents. Although I believe these regulations can't help but decrease visitation to Cape Hatteras National Seashore, inclusion of bypass corridors and reasonable buffer size will have less of an effect on the local economy of the southern villages than more stringent regulation. I encourage the National Park Service to look hard at the SCIENCE, the statistics, and the effect of these actions on the local economy, in determining their final regulations.

As much as I would like to see cooperation of all the parties in this action, and as much as I believe cooperation is the best way to meet the objectives we all want to attain, it has been made apparent at the public hearings that no matter what the final regulations contain, National Audubon and Defenders of Wildlife will challenge these regulations in court. The federal judge responsible for forcing this action to where it is today has tipped the scales of justice out of balance. Developing reasonable policy based upon science and long established objectives of the National Park Service will go a long way in substantiating the policy in any appeal of a court decision.

Thank You For This Opportunity To Comment, Darr Barshis Hatteras, NC Resident

Correspondence ID:	13428	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	N/A, N/A					
Received:	May,11,2010 06:57:54					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Please adopt a modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement, protecting that which makes Cape Hatteras so special--abundant (and endangered) wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore.					
Correspondence ID:	13429	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,11,2010 06:59:42					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.</p> <p>1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."</p> <p>2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...." Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.</p> <p>3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan. As a child of North Carolina, I hope that my own children will be able to enjoy our beautiful unspoiled coast. Please reevaluate your position on ORV to better protect our fragile outer banks and its biodiversity.</p> <p>Thank you, -jen jelllicorse</p>					
Correspondence ID:	13430	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Stump, Dale W					
Received:	May,11,2010 07:00:12					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>Mr Murray</p> <p>After reading and understanding what I could of this in the very short allotted time frame it is easy to see that the best interest of all peoples involved has not been met. Creating a document such as this takes much thought and preparation. It was not done until the parties that should have drawn it up were put into a position that they were required to do so. This is not only an Off Road Vehicle management ruling as stated but it will stand for all peoples doing all things on and in Cape Hatteras Seashore. A simple walk on the beach will also be governed. Even when the beach as stated in your paper was used for transportation in the beginning there was still recreation by the inhabitants of the island. To anyone who enjoys Cape Hatteras National Seashore this document is as profound as the Bill of Rights or The Constitution. With those words I ask of you to go back and find a solution that truly carries the interest of all peoples involved. As it stands now I do not support it. Thank you for your time and hearing one small voice Sir.</p> <p>Sincerely Dale W. Stump</p>					
Correspondence ID:	13431	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Collins, David					
Received:	May,11,2010 07:02:29					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Please don't allow off road vehicles to travel on Cape Hatteras National Park lands. OTV use is very selfish behavior. It is loud, dangerous, and destructive. If people want to enjoy nature, OTVs are not compatible. OTVs should be outlawed from all parks, state and national.					
Correspondence ID:	13432	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,11,2010 07:04:36					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	<p>I disapprove of the National Park Service draft regulations for the off road vehicle management. As one of the groups representing Outer Banks visitors has stated, we should "Protect, not prohibit."</p> <p>My husband and I own a vacation cottage, and our rentals are dependent on people who have historically visited the Outer Banks to walk, fish, and drive on limited areas of the beach. The drastic limitations proposed will cause them to go elsewhere, cutting off revenue to N.C.</p> <p>People who love the beach also love wildlife. They don't need to be banned from access as much as they need to be educated through signage and limited closures. Please do not approve this proposed regulation that will cause much wider buffer zones than are necessary and make it unpredictable whether there will be any access to huge areas of beach.</p> <p>Protect the breeding and nesting areas during the appropriate weeks -- not for entire months. Scale back the number of meters of restricted area to what is used in other sites around the country.</p> <p>Habitat management can be less restrictive if carefully monitored. Human actions have little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles when compared to that of nature itself, and humans will respect signs alerting them to wildlife nesting areas.</p> <p>The beaches of the Outer Banks are a cultural resource. Families and fishermen have been coming here for generations to enjoy our oceanfront. Birds have always adapted to our presence and they will continue to do so. We should be able to walk our pets on leashes. We should be able to know that when we come, there will be ORV access, if not in a restricted area, then in a nearby one. Even when there is wildlife nesting, the beach itself should be open to walkers.</p> <p>Finally, do not punish the southern beaches more than the northern ones. That makes no sense.</p>					
Correspondence ID:	13433	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	

Name: Shackelford, Britton T
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The North Carolina Watermen United would like to respectfully request a 30-day extension of the deadline (May 11, 2010)of the public comment period for the DEIS. Our North Carolina Senators Richard Burr and Kay Hagan have also requested this extension. It seems preposterous that an action started as a graduate school exercise at Duke University by the Environmental & Policy Clinic has blossomed into - 1. Miles of sticks and signs and string on our PUBLIC beaches in our National Park, 2. A devastating effect on our Dare county economy, and 3. An 810-page document without sufficient time for working fishermen to respond. Please grant an extension.

Correspondence ID: 13434 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 07:07:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: ORV's and SUV's destroy the beach, make it dangerous to walk on the beach, and clutter the beach with pollution, noise, and traffic. The more you can provide parking away from the shoreline and walkways to the beach areas the better. I do not go nor take my family to beaches where vehicles are permitted. I think this plan is a good compromise. I visit Cape Hatteras every year and wish for it to remain as natural as possible. Thank you for trying to protect our greatest natural resources.

Correspondence ID: 13435 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Woodiwiss, Kim
Received: May,11,2010 07:09:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am writing to request 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, the abundant and endangered wildlife and the natural quiet of miles of pristine Atlantic seashore. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13436 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 07:10:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I own several businesses based in Buxton, NC - a bakery, a construction business, a vacation rental home, and a charter fishing business. All of my businesses have been adversely affected by the Consent Decree and beach closures. My bakery is down 30%, my construction business (vacation rental homes) is down 90%, my vacation rental home is down 20%, and my charter fishing business is down 75%. Consequently I no longer have work for dozens of locals who used to work for me. While some of this is due to the poor economy, a significant portion of it is due to the NPS beach closures. This EIS and the proposed beach closures will cause even greater harm to my businesses will likely cause some of them to go out of business completely. People don't want to come to Hatteras Island if they can't walk, swim, play, and fish on the beaches. Your EIS and proposed management plans do not adequately account for the massive negative economic impact they will have. Your EIS and the supporting documents, studies, etc., provide no evidence that beach closures are necessary for the protection of birds or turtles. To do so would require proof of bird and turtle kills by beach-goers on a grand scale at Hatteras Island, and you have provided no evidence of this. It is not sufficient to imply, without proof, that human presence on Hatters beaches might or could cause some imagined or conceptual harm to burds or turtles. Your EIS and proposed closures are deficient in that they do not provide for shared use of NPS beaches for recreational and conservation purposes - conservation can and should be achieved with shared human access and protective measures around bird and turtle nesting areas. There is no historical or demonstrated future need for complete, unshared beach closures. The desires of radical, so-called environmental groups to close Hatteras Island beaches and their threats of law suits should not be the basis for NPS management proposals or actions. Only true, demonstrated needs on the part of wildlife and the humans who share NPS beaches should be taken into account when formulating NPS management proposals and actions. NPS should vigorously fight and defend itself against the punitive threats and actions of the radical groups. NPS should develop an ORV and beach use plan that provides for shared human access to all beaches at all times of the year, with adequate and balanced protections for human access, birds, and turtles. It can and should be done. Just because the radicals want complete closures and one-sided solutions doesn't mean the NPS should give it to them. We will fight such efforts because they are neither right nor fair. Those of us who have chosen to live on or visit and enjoy the natural beauties of Hatteras Island do so because we love it. We do all we can to protect its beaches and wildlife. It is not appropriate to deny us the traditional access we have always enjoyed and were promised would not be compromised when we sold, granted, and otherwise conveyed our lands to NPS. The history of the Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore has well shown that human access to the beaches was guaranteed as part of the land conveyance and NPS should not break that promise. NPS should work with residents, user groups, and environmental groups to develop shared access management plans that respect that promise while providing reasonable protection for wildlife. It can be done and NPS should not give in to pressures and arbitrary timetables to do otherwise. If it takes longer to accomplish than provided for by the Consent Decree or other timetables, then use your legal staff, the judicial system, the legislative system (elected officials), and the news media to get the time concessions needed to come up with a balanced management plan. NPS will rightfully get fights from both sides if it's management plan is not balanced and fair. Right now NPS is leaning far too much towards the radical closure side of the issue. Thanks for your time.

Correspondence ID: 13437 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 07:10:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have traveled to Cape Hatteras Nat'l Seashore on an annual basis - both on and off season - since I was a child. ORV use has always been a part of our family outings. The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation. Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a

level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13438 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Brengel, Kristen

Received: May,11,2010 07:13:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: May 11, 2010

Superintendent Michael Murray Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, North Carolina 27954

Re: Comments on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off Road Vehicle Management Plan / Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Mr. Murray:

The National Parks Conservation Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, and The Wilderness Society are grateful for this opportunity to comment on this Off Road Vehicle Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The Cape Hatteras National Seashore (CAHA) is a nationally significant resource for and to all Americans. It represents one of the last vestiges of open, wild, and undeveloped beaches on the eastern seacoast of the United States and provides protected habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife.

In reviewing the DEIS, we find that all of the alternatives presented in the draft privilege off-road vehicle use (ORV) over and above all other visitor uses and experiences. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the natural resources, wildlife and qualities that make CAHA a nationally significant resource.

We agree that the "environmentally preferable" Alternative D would cause the least environmental impact of the alternatives presented in the DEIS.

Under this alternative, we have several concerns about year-round vehicular traffic and how it impacts other visitors and wildlife. As a consequence, we are willing to support a modified Alternative D that includes and recognizes the following points.

Wilderness

The CAHA authorizing legislation states, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational use, particularly swimming, boating, sailing, fishing, and other recreational activities of similar nature, which shall be developed for such uses as needed, the said areas shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness?(DEIS, p. 46)."

This language indicates the intent to manage CAHA as a primitive wilderness with some exceptions. Unfortunately, this document is the first attempt by the agency to identify areas for one particular recreational use ? off-road vehicles. The wilderness term carries management implications that are not addressed in the DEIS and that are not compatible with recreational ORV use. Consequently, CAHA should be using wilderness policy principles in its management of recreational off-road vehicles as per the enabling legislation and 2006 Management Policies --these wilderness policy principles should be spelled out in the FEIS.

Congress enacted the Wilderness Act on September 3, 1964. The Act designated over 9 million acres of wilderness within the nation's national forests, administered by the Department of Agriculture. For the lands administered by the Department of the Interior within the National Park System, Congress required the Secretary to "review every roadless area of five thousand contiguous acres or more?and? report to the President his recommendation as to the suitability or unsuitability of each such area?for preservation as wilderness. The President shall advise the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representative of his recommendation with respect to the designation as wilderness of each such area?on which review has been completed, together with a map thereof and a definition of its boundaries." Congress directed that the Secretary complete this review by September 3, 1974.

For parks in existence on September 3, 1964, the ten years after 1964 saw Presidents Johnson, Nixon and Ford transmit to Congress many wilderness recommendations. There are a number of parks that were in existence on the date of enactment of the Wilderness Act for which the NPS has never fulfilled the Congressional mandate to "review every roadless area of five thousand contiguous acres or more?and? report to the President his recommendation as to the suitability or unsuitability of each such area?for preservation as wilderness." CAHA is one of these areas.

It is tragic that NPS has been so institutionally unresponsive to Congressional wilderness review mandates. CAHA provides an example where, if this mandate had been fulfilled at any time since 1964, many of the user conflicts that are currently wracking the Seashore may have been avoided. It is also clearly evident, that any comprehensive attempt to establish an ORV management plan, should have been preceded, informed, and bounded by a wilderness suitability study. It is our position that it is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience through environmentally appropriate access to primitive wilderness. As a consequence, we urge the National Park Service to execute and produce the wilderness suitability study for CAHA that is now 35 years overdue (see Management Policies 2006, Ch. 6).

Wildlife

The National Park Service cannot abrogate its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) must clearly assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources including increasing management protections as necessary in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis to achieve desired future conditions and species recovery goals.

In the analysis of the specific wildlife conservation and management implications of the DEIS, we concur with the comments submitted by Audubon North Carolina, National Audubon Society, Defenders of Wildlife, and Southern Environmental Law Center, with the following additional comments. First, with regard to desired future conditions (species recovery goals) we believe that NPS is choosing long-term targets, and possibly short-term targets that are too low. For piping plover (DEIS, p. 8), the long term target is 30 breeding pairs. However, the footnote indicates that CAHA could potentially support 30-60 pairs, and actual population growth at other sites has exceeded the projections. Consequently, if CAHA could potentially support more than 60 breeding pairs, the long term target should be at least 60 breeding pairs.

Second, in the section on "Issues and Impact Topics" (DEIS, p. 29), it states that "Nesting sea turtles at the Seashore include the loggerhead, green, and leatherback turtles." However, when desired future conditions are discussed (DEIS, p. 8), loggerheads are the only species for which short-term and long-term targets are stated. Again, the long-term loggerhead target is set low at 115 nests, when the footnote states the 50 year projection as being 201 nests. If there is a scientifically based 50 year projection, then why is a lower number being chosen for a long-term target? What is the basis for this choice?

Also, the DEIS needs to include projections and targets for green and leatherback turtles. "From 2000 to 2009, there was an annual average of four green turtle nests at the Seashore, with a peak of nine nests in 2005 (DEIS, p.216)." Nesting by leatherback turtles at the seashore was first documented in 1998 and there have been six known nests since 2000 (DEIS, p.216). These very low numbers cannot be an excuse for not setting recovery projections and targets. In fact, just the opposite is the case, the lower the numbers the more important the projections and targets become.

Alternative Transportation Systems for Federal Public Lands

In 2005, the SAFETEA-LU legislation established a new program called the Alternative Transportation in Parks and Public Lands program, changed in 2008 to the Paul S. Sarbanes Transit in the Parks program. Administered by the Federal Transit Administration in partnership with the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service, the program funds capital and planning expenses for alternative transportation systems in national parks and public lands. The goals of the program are to conserve natural, historical, and cultural resources; reduce congestion and pollution; improve visitor mobility and accessibility; enhance visitor experience; and ensure access to all, including persons with disabilities.

Programs, resources, and expertise now exist that CAHA can access and could employ to answer the questions: Are there feasible alternatives to recreational ORV use in getting visitors on and off the beach including those with fishing equipment? Specifically, NPS should be contemplating whether some sort of environmentally sensitive mass transit system could accomplish the objective of getting people efficiently on and off the beach while reducing the number of vehicles and vehicle trips. If such a study is too complex for the FEIS, then the FEIS should assert and spell out that such

a study is needed, will follow the FEIS, and that NPS will adaptively adjust its management in light of an alternative transportation study. Moreover, such a study should be complementary to the wilderness suitability study, previously discussed, to distinguish precisely between those areas where mass transport of visitors is suitable and those where it is not (i.e. wilderness).

Management Policies 2006

The "objectives in taking action" (DEIS, pp. 2-3), "desired future conditions" (DEIS, p. 7), and management policies discussion (DEIS, p. 44) are all missing significant requirements under the 2006 Management Policies. We request that NPS expand the "desired future conditions" section beyond species management and include goals from the management policies on least impacting vehicles and motorized equipment (Management Policies 2006, 8.2.3; 8.2.3.1; 6.4.3.3), noise (Management Policies 2006, 4.9), appropriate uses (Management Policies 2006, 8.1.1), and wilderness (Management Policies 2006, Ch. 6). These policies are essential guideposts for determining whether a recreational use is appropriate and causing unacceptable impacts in National Park System units. In addition, we believe they are critical for determining whether or not the agency is upholding its management duties under the Organic Act. We would urge the agency to develop a set of desired future conditions for 1) motorized equipment 2) noise 3) appropriate use and 4) wilderness.

In conclusion, we are in complete accord with Audubon North Carolina, National Audubon Society, Defenders of Wildlife, and Southern Environmental Law Center on the following point.

The regulation to govern off-road vehicle use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore will be the most important action by the National Park Service in the history of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The regulation will determine the future of the Seashore. It will determine the future for North Carolina's beach-nesting shore and waterbird populations, the health of migrating and wintering shorebird populations, North Carolina's sea turtle populations, and the fate of other natural resources. Equally important, it will determine the quality of the Seashore experience for more than 2.25 million visitors annually and it will shape public sentiment toward the National Park Service as the stewards of the most significant natural landmarks of the United States.

We are thankful for the opportunity to provide these comments. We appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. And we look forward to an FEIS that addresses and incorporates our concerns.

Sincerely,

Chris Watson, Program Manager National Parks Conservation Association
Charles Clusen, Director, National Parks Project Natural Resources Defense Council
Leslie Jones, General Counsel The Wilderness Society

Correspondence ID: 13439 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Russell, Gregory L
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Date: May 11, 2010 To: National Park Service From: Gregory L. Russell Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]. No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas. 2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: Carrying capacity would be a peak use limit determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront. If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page six and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative F. I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15. 4) Page 1: I agree with your statement ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors.
However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc) 5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well. 6) Page 121 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CANT get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two buffered ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. 7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access. 8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS. 9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%. So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! Its insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.
10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National

Park. 11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement protect and preserve natural and cultural resources appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages. Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts. Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI. On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a negligible to moderate adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement. I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended. Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial. Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts. Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to adapt to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible. 13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out. Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed. Why would a group of surf fishermen want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS. 14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages. = No Pets in public areas beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 July 31.

15) Pages 125; 392 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection. 16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years. 17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area. Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates. 18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas. Conclusion: Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed. It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Lets scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date. The USFS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the publics right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying Protect, not Prohibit. Thank you and sincerely yours, Greg Russell

Correspondence ID: 13440 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, N/A

Received: May, 11, 2010 07:17:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation. Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13441 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Sawyer, Fred A

Received: May,11,2010 07:18:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hatteras Island is a special place for many people. Residents and tourists alike. Like many I have a business on the island, Avon to be specific. My wife and I have owned The Froggy Dog Restaurant for the past 15 years. Over the last two years I have had the opportunity to meet and chat with people from all over the United States and many countries. Most do not understand how an organization can close so much of the beaches for the protection of birds that are not endangered. Many have said they will not return because they are denied access. These are young families that can't walk to the beach because they can't carry all that is necessary for a fun family day. How are disabled people suppose to enjoy the beaches when they can't get there? The buffers established for the protection of certain birds is far to extreme and has put Hatteras Island on the endangered list. There are families that can't hang on much longer. Their way of life has been severely compromised. I ask that you listen to the Governor, Senators and all who have written letters in support of beach access and not the organizations that do not live, vacation or work here.

Correspondence ID: 13442 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 07:25:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have followed the beach access issues closely, written my elected representatives, and advocated to friends the need to keep the beaches open as in the past, both preserving the local economy and fulfilling the promises made to the locals and to all citizens of this country when the Cape Hatteras Recreational Area was established. Instead of uniting all the Park users behind the conservation of all Park wildlife, including the endangered piping plover, present policies have divided the Park users and denied traditional users full traditional use of the Park. Outside special interests, having unlimited funding, have trampled over the rights of all traditional users. I urge you to return to the policies of the previous interim plan, then finalize a permanent plan that protects all the animals using the Park, including the humans. Thanks, JIM

Correspondence ID: 13443 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 07:29:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank You for taking the time to read my comments, i will be simple, the DEIS was the hardest thing ever to read and lawyers have made too much money twisting science in one direction. We love traveling the sounds by boat showing my grandson all the wonderful wild life and birds along the sound shore and dredge islands, wow, how plentiful. The impact on Turtles and birds from storms & erosion is sad to see. BUT it is easier to blame a car and driver than GOD.Replenish the beaches with sand and ALL thrive. ROUTES - Alt.F. too MANY restrictions - I DISAGREE WITH NPS- Why is Bodie Island and Ocracoke so restricted and Pea Island Not included as the top pedestrian beach? I have never seen or heard of a plover hit by a ORV. CLOSURES DUE TO BIRDS - ML1& ML2 Buffers too big/restrictive-I DISAGREE NPS CLOSURES DUE TO TURTLES - Love those little guys, Why not use more hatchling proactive relocation and watch teams. I DISAGREE WITH NPS. Why does the NPS FAIL to stand up for the Cultural and Historical Value that open access to nature teaches our children and instills in our visitors giving them that GREAT feeling on each return to CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA. NOT A HOW DID THIS HAPPEN TO US. I DO AGGREE WITH PERMITS, DAY PASSES AND FEE'S TO PAY FOR THE EDUCATION AND INFORMATION REGARDING ORV BEACH TRAVEL. NOT KILLING FOXES AND RACOONS. THANK YOU SO MUCH, Please use all science and information so we don't have the GLOBAL WARMING DEBACAL in our back yard.

Correspondence ID: 13444 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 07:30:24
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: 13445 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Stump, Sharon P
Received: May,11,2010 07:30:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr Murray
Having lived on this wonderful island since 1985 and calling it home has been a slice of the pleasures of life. Prior to that it was a vacation destination since 1972. Parties are about to put a paper into action that will change all lives here forever. The parts of the document that I was able to read through seem to possibly have much room for error. The wording can be massaged to have multiple meanings. All people who enjoy this island have an equal stand in this document and all should be covered equally. Balance is hard to find but it does exist somehow and must be met. The people put their trust in the actions and words of others and hope that they strive to give their absolute best in all things. This document will restrict all people who come to enjoy the island, the surfer, kite flyer, kite boarder, fisherperson and any and all people, not just Off Road Vehicles. As it is titled the document is misleading in those words. I cannot support this ruling as it exists at this point. I ask as but one person with the voice of many do this as it should be, with all parties involved taken into account. Thank you for your consideration in this.
Sincerely
Sharon P. Stump

Correspondence ID: 13446 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a full time resident of Frisco, NC. and a frequent user of "OUR" park lands, I would like to comment on the DEIS assessment for vehicle and pedestrian access.
As a professional wildlife and sports photographer, I applaud the idea of protecting our precious threatened wildlife species and open spaces. It is one of the reasons I live here. The NPS has done a great job of protecting and educating all those who visit. My son plans to join the NPS when he graduates college. I cherish the wildlife here, and fully believe in protecting endangered species. I get it.
However, I am deeply concerned about the changes in restrictions proposed for these areas based on extremely questionable science. I have no problem closing off more space to ORV access, but lets be reasonable about keeping easily patrolled corridors open to the public to access some of the popular fishing and recreational areas like Cape Point, and the inlets. The impact of closing these areas down will carry enormous implications for the local economy and the visitor experience we depend on, while having negligible effect on the threatened species you intend to protect.
Our economy is already on shaky ground due to recent national fiscal events. Most businesses are barely making it. These restrictions will be the final straw. Thousands of hard working families that have lived here for generations will be forced out, Real estate values will most likely plummet. You will single handedly ruin these precious island lives based on unproven theories.
1. Please explain, why there has never been a public list of reported incidents to back up the assumptions made by the NPS regarding endangered species and their nests. As far as the public is informed, on record, only one incident has been reported, and no charges were brought against or for the individuals involved.
2. Why does the NPS not include Pea Island as critical habitat, when listing protected areas and the need for more restrictions?
3. As there have been NO reported Piping Plover deaths attributed to ORVs, and the new signage now in place has contributed to a decrease in other ORV violations, why not continue along these lines?
4. Why are the new 1000m buffers more excessive than other comparable park service land? There are more NPS personnel than there are plovers.
5. Why can't the buffers allow for patrolled corridors to allow ORV and pedestrian access?
6. Why is the NPS spending so much time and resource trying to manage on one of the least impacting threats to these endangered species? Clearly Mammalian predators, weather, nest abandonment and crab predators far exceed the threat of humans.
Cape Hatteras sea shore is one of the nations great resources for people to enjoy the outdoors. Fishing, water sports, family activities away from the chaos of everyday life and jobs has made this a popular destination for many decades. The NPS has always been a positive part of this experience through education, preservation of the great monuments, and management. This visitor experience has maintained the livelihoods of thousands of local residents and their families.
Please consider the impact these reckless changes will have on this precious place based on extremely questionable data.
thank you,
Lane duPont

Correspondence ID: 13447 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 07:39:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Sirs - I know you have received many comments on the Cape Hatteras Draft ORV Management Plan, so I will keep mine short. I disagree with this plan to close access points and further limit access, both vehicular and pedestrian. While I have been following this debate for some time, I simply have not seen definitive data indicating that these proposals will further protect the wildlife on our beaches it is intended to. I do believe however that it will result in severely limiting access to these beautiful areas without providing substantial benefits. Please reconsider this proposal.
Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13448 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 07:39:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Any attempt by the federal government, environmental groups or any other "special interest" groups to close or restrict ORV from the Cape Hatteras National Seashore would impact the lives and financial support to the people of Hatteras Island. And that's the problem, plain and simple. These folks rely on people like me who have been fishing on the island for the last 37 years. Many folks like me who fish their have a respect for nature and in no way would damage, destroy or even trash a place we love so much. Over the years I have bought my children and grandchildren to Hatteras Island because of its beauty and peacefulness. Where else can children have a place to enjoy where they can learn to swim, fish, surf and have a cookout on the beach with family. Over the years I have got to know many fine folks who love their island and are the probably the best stewards in keeping the island safe, clean and protected for all who visit there including the wildlife.
I've heard of some of the claims made by special interest groups who come across as wanting to good for the environment. What I can't understand is why they are so hell bend on closing or restricting ORV on Hatteras Island because of a few who break the rules. In using that same logic we should close all highways from vehicular traffic because of a few speeders and drunk drivers. It makes no sense unless they, special interest, has some other hidden agenda.
As an outdoors man, fisherman, old surfer and a friend to the people of Hatteras Island I only ask that any plan in protecting wildlife on the Island should not restrict the use of ORV to where lives of the people of Hatteras Island is damaged. If you look close you will see that those folks are endangered also or didn't you realize that.

Correspondence ID: 13449 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 07:42:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with any and all restrictions to beach access.
I own a rental house in Avon NC. Any restrictions of any kind would reduce the number of people comming to the Island.
I am concerned about the reduction of property values and the reductin of income from my realeatate investment.
Thank You
Larry Durgin

Correspondence ID: 13450 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 07:43:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am against the ORV plan as it is written. I believe that the beaches that are in front of the Frisco and Hatteras villages should remain closed ORV use. This is an issue of pedestrian safety in highly used areas of the beach. Moreover, the park service does not have the man power to enforce the speed

limit on the beach. If the park service can not monitor the mixed use of those beaches than they should remain closed to ORVs.

Correspondence ID: 13451 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Stange, Dodd
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.
Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.
Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13452 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 07:46:18
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear NPS,
As a local of Hatteras Island, I know and have experienced first hand the economic distress beach closures cause. This Island has been home to my immediate family and other relatives for at least a hundred years, and if the beaches continue to close and the tourism continues to decrease, my family will no longer be able to survive financially on Hatteras Island, our home. One day I aspire to be able to bring my children to Hatteras Island to show them where they come from, and as of right now those chances are slim. As an employee of the restaurant business I encounter many people; natives, tourist, life-long visitors etc. who voice their concern for the lively hood of Hatteras Island, and they have every right to. This Island is a haven for many people, not just locals. Statistically North Carolina has a decently high unemployment rate, if the beaches continue to close, causing business to shutdown or cut back on hired help, then the unemployment rate will only continue to rise. As a student at the University of North Carolina Wilmington, I depend on the summer tourism to finance my education, and as a result of these beach closures, the tourism has decreased, making it more difficult for me to personally finance my education. I am only one of many students from the Outer Banks experiencing this. For the past few years gradually the areas of land closed off to public access have gotten larger and have remained "roped off" for longer periods of time to protect Piping Plovers. Why are we protecting a bird that is not native to Hatteras Island? I As long as these animals are not intentionally being injured, killed, or their nests destroyed, the process of their endangerment is a direct result of their incompetence as animals. It happens, has the National Park Service ever heard of Natural Selection? Why would the government risk the well being of thousands of residents to protect one species of bird? I beg of you to re-examine this situation and find a "happy" medium that will benefit all, not just some animal.
Sincerely,
Amber N. McDowell

Correspondence ID: 13453 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Yochum, Ronald C
Received: May,11,2010 07:51:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Access to beaches is a continuing activity that spans the entire history of the Outer Banks. From before the creation of a paved road, the only access through the islands was the beach.
Before the island was a national park, access was everywhere. The preservation of the island as a national park was to continue access, not limit it. Forbidding access will put you in direct contradiction to the purpose of these national parks.
There are many other barrier islands south of OBX that provide uninhabited and undisturbed areas.
Today, the island's economy is directly driven by tourism. Tourists come to the Outer Banks for what is has today. Driving on the beaches is a necessary component to a vibrant economy. Restricting or eliminating beach driving will have a detrimental effect on the livelihoods of thousands of individuals as well as destroying a vacation spot for millions.
The solution to this problem is simple: Park Rangers patrol the beach regularly. They can cordon-off areas that are being used when there is evidence of egg-laying of turtles.
Provide for severe fines for littering, speeding, or hazardous driving.
Finally, if you look at the numbers of beach drivers, the numbers are relatively consistent. Growth on the island is metered by the fact that there is only so much buildable land, and economic concerns there limit excessive growth as well. The amount of driving on the beaches isn't growing. In fact, over the years I have come to see less driving than ever.
Do not remove driving. Its our heritage.

Correspondence ID: 13454 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife.
I look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13455 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Parsons, Debra M
Received: May,11,2010 07:52:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family and I have been spending entire summers in this area for the past two years. This issue has become important to us as we share the outdoor experience of the outerbanks on a daily basis from early June to end of August each year. We are responsible people who respect the boundaries imposed on us during our stay, yet very disappointed at the hindrance to our experience because of your restrictions. Now we are to expect FURTHER

restriction? This is unacceptable to me. 1. Penalize those who break the law, not further restrict those who obey it like me who just want to enjoy the outdoors. 2. EDUCATE people so they do not break the law through ignorance. 3. Allow ORV and pedestrian access. It is too restrictive for those obeying the law. Much of the summer I am unable to drive on the beach to areas we want to fish and it is over 2 mile walk with equipment which is not reasonable. Law abiding people will respect the species you are protecting. 4. Elderly and handicapped access to beach areas are needed by vehicle. It seems so easy to me that this is the answer and I am surprised at the clouded nature of your decree. It seems it is contradictory and confusing in nature on purpose almost so that the average person is not able to decipher it. By nature, those who routinely recreate in the outdoors and choose this type of environment for their home respect it and care for it. Again, penalize those who do not respect and break the law. Educate those who may be visiting and do not know the restrictions. Allow access to beach areas for recreation while preserving the protected species.

Correspondence ID: 13456 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: McIntosh, Natalie
Received: May,11,2010 07:54:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a new resident of Rodanthe, I was drawn to this area mainly for the access to beaches on both the ocean and sound of Cape Hatteras. I believe that open access for fishing, kiting, dogs and vehicles can be managed successfully, taking into account the special habitat of the area. If access is rigorously restricted, the quality of life for residents and visitors alike will be negatively impacted. The economy of the area will suffer as visitors vote with their feet and take their vacation dollars elsewhere.
From what I have observed both as a resident and a visitor is that most users of the natural resources have a vested interest in maintaining the quality of the beaches and supporting the habitat. If you have spent any time on the beaches in Massachusetts, you'll understand how limiting privately held beaches are - Cape Hatteras shouldn't become like that in effect by closing most of the beaches to the public.

Correspondence ID: 13457 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 07:54:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family enjoyed vacations on the outer banks for 12 consecutive years until we were faced with beach closures. The great surf fishing accessible via orv is our main draw. I believe that orv traffic is more productive to the nesting birds by keeping them pushed higher up on the dunes instead of low nest that are washed away during a storm surge. As for the turtles which have an extremely high mortality rate from natural predation, why not encourage local college students as a class project to incubate turtle eggs and return them to the sea free from being consumed by raccoons, foxes, gulls etc. the bottom line is we can coexist with wildlife but we can't exist if the authorities make decisions that are destructive to our economies.

Correspondence ID: 13458 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Franco, Debbie L
Received: May,11,2010 07:56:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I was just informed of this being voted on last night. Not living in the area, some of this doesn't get to me quick, but I was so distrubed of this vote, I needed to voice my outrage. My husband and I have been going to these great beaches for over 10 years. I have only observed the fisherman and pet owners repecting the beaches. All of this simply does not make sense to me.
The communities rely on the fishermen and tourism (with pets) to make a living, you are killing them!
Beacause I am a pet owner as well as a fisherman, not having the ability to take my vacation in this fine area breaks my heart. Please re-consider, you are punishing the very people that care for these beaches and wildlife.
Sincerely,
Debbie Franco

Correspondence ID: 13459 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Jarvis, Ollie R
Received: May,11,2010 07:58:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Have you folks thought of the economic impact this will do to all our villages that depend on tourism, especially the folks that come to the best spot on the east coast to fish Not only will it impact our businesses it will impact the state's revenue from the taxes we generate. There are plenty of land that these birds can go to, why take the prime fishing spots? Take the canadian hole property also.

Correspondence ID: 13460 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.
4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."
However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)
5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.
Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages ? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts. ? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "?prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Debra Edwards Scott P O Box 354 Avon NC 27915

Correspondence ID: 13461 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:00:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Following please find my comments on the DEIS for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore draft ORV plan.

1. The document does a good job of selecting no-action alternatives. In a complex situation such as this with a long history of various levels of management and ORV control it is difficult to establish a no-action baseline to serve as a comparison point for the considered alternatives.

2a. The document contains significant shortcomings in its consideration of the negative impacts of the increased restrictions on pets in the Seashore. For example, on page xviii of the Executive Summary, the Table addressing impacts to the "Visitor Use and Experience " makes no mention of the negative impacts to the visitor experience of not allowing visitors to bring leashed pets for significant portions of the main tourist season.

In the order of 30% to 40% of the rental houses in the Villages are "pet houses" and a very cursory inspection of the housing areas or the beaches would find that a significant number of visitors consider the ability to bring their pet as a positive part of their Seashore visit experience. Under the proposed action this positive experience would not be possible for many people for much of the tourist season, a fact totally ignored in the impacts analysis.

2b. The economic analysis also ignores the negative impacts of the pet restrictions. Much of the economic analysis is based on recent business surveys of the impacts of the Court ordered beach restrictions. However, the court order DID NOT include any pet restrictions and therefore the impacts of the proposed pet restrictions would NOT be evident in those surveys. The analysis did not make any attempt to look at the number of rental "pet houses" in the Villages and analyze the negative economic impacts if those visitors, faced with having to leave their pets at home, concluded that one of the significant attractions of the Hatteras Seashore had been eliminated and then decided to vacation somewhere else.

2c. The rationale for the pet restrictions is totally lacking in scientific evidence and logical rigor. Firstly, it appears to have been pulled out of the air with no scientific basis. None of the studies cited in Appendix A identified leashed pets as even a minor factor in destruction of shorebird nests. Over and over, study after study, and I will use as just one example Patterson 1991 on page A-5, found that 90% of losses were due to predation by wild species.

Secondly, the ban lacks any logical basis. Nowhere in the DEIS is it explained how a leashed pet poses a risk to a shorebird nest. To the contrary, if you stationed a leashed pet every 100 yards along the beach, it is more likely that they would deter and scare away the mammalian predators that are the main cause of nesting failures.

3. I strongly disagree with the NPS statement on Page 201: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." This is a statement without any basis in fact. No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

4. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer-reviewed science. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200-meter buffer per other sites in the nation for the piping plover.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

5a. I disagree with the decision to "ignore" Pea Island as if it does not exist. NEPA specifically proscribes agencies from "segmenting" actions to avoid having to address impacts that occur from their cumulative actions. While not exactly "segmenting," the decision to exclude Pea Island from the development of protective measures for shorebirds and turtles violates that principle in that it segments, contiguous identical ecosystems and ignores their cumulative effects on shorebirds, turtles and ORV users. There are already significant sections of the Outer Banks (Pea Island and no mention was even made of Portsmouth Island) that are ORV free. Pretending that they don't exist is both poor science and dubious logic. And yes, I understand that Pea Island is under the management of FWS, a different agency than the NPS, but is it that difficult for the two agencies to coordinate and cooperate on something that is apparently so important as shorebird protection?

5b. Also please explain also how Pea Island can be in the ROI for economic analyses but not included when it comes to ecological analyses.

6a. I disagree with your decision to include the upper beach areas in the ROI (Pages 270-281; 561-598). The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. By your own data, for example, the upper beach areas have a density of 500 to 1000 people per square mile while areas below the Bonner Bridge have only less than 250. There are also significant differences in per capita income (being much less below the Bonner Bridge), which will exacerbate the negative economic impacts on the Village areas.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages ? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or countywide level impacts. ? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI. On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement. 6b. The DEIS also refers to some, as yet unpublished additional economic data. You realize, of course, that if you release this data, you will have to re-open the DEIS for additional comments or release a supplemental DEIS and re-open the public comment period.

7. Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

8a. The decisions on ORV restrictions are not supported by the science cited in the DEIS nor the obvious facts or investigations available.

The literature review in Appendix A is inconclusive, at best, in supporting ORV restrictions as a way of increasing shorebird breeding success. For example, the following quotes are taken directly from that Appendix:

? "no difference in mean productivity of Plover nesting was observed among the levels of ORV use" (page A-4)

? "ORV use was directly investigated in this study?the primary cause of nest failure on barrier islands was mammalian predation" (page A-5)

? "the study (Patterson, 1991) found that predators accounted for most of the known nest losses (91%) with only one nest lost due to direct human

destruction and no evidence that suggested recreational disturbance was a factor in productivity" (page A-5)

? Even the Park service data do not support ORV damage as a significant cause of nest failure. Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own statistics, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%. So human interference accounts for only 3%. Yet the Park Service wants to ban humans to solve the problem.

Please explain how in the face of this science, that ORV restrictions seem to be the approach of choice to increase shorebird breeding success.

8b. Also please explain how one cannot conclude, that given this data, there will be very little improvement in shorebird breeding success after five years of implementation and that the next five years will only result in MORE beach closures as opposed to an admission that this plan did not work.

8c. Why did the Park Service not use the very excellent "lab" that is at their disposal to directly study the impacts of various levels of human access to shorebird habitat on breeding success? Portsmouth Island has no ORV use and essentially no pedestrian use, Pea Island has no ORV use but relatively easy pedestrian access, and Hatteras Island has both ORV and pedestrian access. What are the relative shorebird breeding success rates on these three places? Is there a difference? Or is the limiting factor the fact that Hatteras is at the very far extreme southern edge of the breeding range of the Piping Plover (Peterson, Field Guide to the Birds, Ease of the Rockies, 1990)?

9. The "action" alternatives do not meet NEPA standards. NEPA requires that agencies look at a range of alternatives and that is sorely lacking in this document.

I realize that this document is a DEIS for an ORV Management Plan. But a cursory look at the history of the issue and this document, and simply counting the pages in the DEIS dedicated to certain subjects leads to the conclusion that this document is just as much about shorebird protection, and that is a reasonable and admirable goal. However, the action alternatives, C though F are all only about varying the degrees of ORV restrictions to satisfy the goals of shorebird (and turtle) protection. It has obviously been assumed from the beginning that the Park Service will expend their resources on finding shorebird nests and blocking off areas of the beaches. This is not a RANGE of alternatives; it is really just a set of sub-alternatives that vary the degree of beach closure.

Where are the alternatives that consider other methods of expending valuable and limited Park Service resources to promote shorebird nesting success? For example, as cited elsewhere in my comments and also in the DEIS, trash is claimed to be a big factor in attracting mammalian predators that are again cited as being the major factor in nesting failures. What if the Park Service drove the beaches twice per day and picked up trash and worked with the Villages to increase security of trash containers and better control access to trash of raccoons, etc. - would this approach have more beneficial impacts on shorebird survival than an alternative of beach closures?

What about alternatives that expend the resources on mammalian predator control?

Again, the Park Service has limited resources to spend on both ORV management AND shorebird protection ? the DEIS needs to identify and address a RANGE of alternatives to meet these goals. You can't just respond that all alternatives include mammalian predator control; there needs to be a real alternative that directs more resources toward this approach and less towards beach closure as well as other alternatives.

To reiterate ? NEPA requires a real range of alternatives to achieve agency goals, not just some straw men and then some simple variations on one basic solution and the document is seriously flawed in this respect.

10. The analyses assume (page 319) that recreational users create trash that attracts mammalian predators. I strongly disagree with this assumption. This assumption appears to be based on one cited study (USFWS, 1996a). I do not have access to the Administrative Record to review this study and determine if it is really relevant (e.g., was it performed in a low density area like outer banks beaches or a high density park site) however no effort was made to collect actual data that would have been very easy to collect. How much trash is actually generated in various areas of the Seashore by different users? After more than 20 years of driving the beaches of the outer banks, it is my observation that ORV users leave essentially no trash on the beach. I have never seen an ORV drive away from trash left on the beach, especially organic matter that would attract a mammal scavenger. Virtually all of the trash found on Hatteras beaches has washed up from the sea. Although, I have seen multiple occurrences of raccoons and opossums scavenging trash out of containers in the Villages. So there may be trash that is serving as a supplemental food source for mammalian predators but it is not nearly so simple as the assumption that seems to drive much of the decision making process. And some very easy and inexpensive surveys would have contradicted that assumption and allowed the Park Service to reach a sound scientific and logically defensible solution.

Major analyses in the DEIS are based on an erroneous assumption about the sources and locations of trash which is cited as the main attractant for the predators who are also the primary cause of breeding failures.

Correspondence ID:	13462	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 08:00:33						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I have been vacationing in the Outer Banks since the early 1970's. The Cape Hatteras NP has some of the most pristine and ecologically valuable beach stretches in our country. To allow vehicular traffic on these beaches would be one of the poorest management decisions ever made by NPS. The federal government system of parks has a responsibility to protect the biodiversity and ecological structure within their boundaries for future generations. As our climate changes, population and development explode- particularly near the coastline, our shorelines and the flora and fauna living there are increasingly threatened. NPS does not have direct decision making power over all of the threats in our coastal zone, but you do have the power to limit direct damage through vehicular traffic on your beaches. There are many other stretches of beach where people who feel the overwhelming desire to drive on a beach may do so. The piping plovers, nesting sea turtles, and other plants and animals trying to survive within your relatively narrow boundaries don't have as many options for survival. Survival should outweigh recreational enjoyment in every instance. Thank you for allowing me to provide comments on this plan.						

Correspondence ID:	13463	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 08:00:50						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	After reading the entire DEIS, and seeing that F is the proposed alternative, I must disagree. There is no guarantee that future ORV access will ever be constructed along with additional pedestrian access. There is no mention of a budgeting line item to include such work. Also the 1000 meter buffer required seems quite large and almost arbitrary. I can find no other protection scheme similar to this for a species of concern. Something in the order of 100 to 300 yards would more reasonable and similar to current practices around the country. We vacation to this area to fish and stargaze. Remote areas far from city lights and the noises of the city are important for these activities. The size and weight of the equipment needed require vehicle transport. Included in our vacation activities is bringing my elderly mother who has been coming to the Outer Banks area for several dozen years and can no longer walk onto the beach. We have already had our vacation experience diminished in 2009 because the location we rent is out of business presumably due to the lack of tourism associated with limited beach access. For this summer we are already finding it hard to make reservations on Ocracoke because so many places are closed or booked because other places are closed. I believe a more practical approach is required for this matter of limiting access to the beach. Statistics can be shown to prove any point you desire - often telling the truth, but not the whole truth. My family and I request you not limit beach access at all allowing corridors around protected species. Please consider how your decision will actually impact those that pay your salary. Hank Blackwood Dalton, GA						

Correspondence ID:	13464	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Cunningham, Keith A				
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Date: May 10, 2010				

To: National Park Service
 From: Keith A. Cunningham

Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments

My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

What if the handicapped person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you close off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and close off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are way too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. More than ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

The percentage due to human interference is only just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlviii, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits.

The current proposal will absolutely devastate the local economy.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rental of my vacation home. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs. This would seem to be a very reasonable compromise.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the statistics and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Keith A. Cunningham Kinnakeet Shores Homeowner

Correspondence ID: 13465 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 08:07:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We love driving on the beach at OBX. We have been doing it for years and really feel it adds to the trip. For those renters in Avon who do not have direct beach access, it is more convenient for them to put their beach items in their car and drive over. It's a perk to going to the beach for them, just knowing they don't have to carry floats, chairs, umbrellas, toys, kites, coolers, etc. For those who surf fish - who wants to lug all their equipment out to the beach? Fishing poles, tackle, bait, coolers, chairs, etc. Not being able to drive on the beach would be a deterrent to those who do not have the luxury of renting beachfront. The ramps are already closed when the birds are laying their eggs...why limit that even more?

Correspondence ID: 13466 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Thomas Jr, Purvis E
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Mike Murray Supt. Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Supt. Murray
Please accept this letter as my comments on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the NPS DEIS, I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Sincerely Purvis E. Thomas Jr.
Durham, NC

Correspondence ID: 13467 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:10:59

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: 13468 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 08:11:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: There is nothing in this thing that is acceptable, As a fisherman not being able to stay on the beach and fish at night is one of the worst. Not being allowed to have dogs is just dumb, my dogs are part of my family, what am I to do with them? Cape Hatteras is/was a National Park..... meant for people, yes that's right people, not meant to be a wildlife refuge. The Birds these people are trying to protect are not endangered and they are not even in their normal range on Hatteras.

Correspondence ID: 13469 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Griffith, Jennifer

Received: May,11,2010 08:13:21

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: 13470 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 08:16:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I own commercial and rental property on Hatteras Island for over 35 years. The impact of the beach access restrictions in addition to the state of the current economic downturn will prove to have a catastrophic impact on the businesses and residents of Hatteras Island. Over these years I have found that the visitors who choose to vacation here do so because of their respect for the beauty and the natural environment of the area. The locals have proved to be honorable keepers of their environmental surroundings and should be commended for being trusted protectors of the habitat. It is appalling that a handful of protestors can have such a negative impact on 'we the people' enjoying this God-given land. The impact this will have on local businesses and the NC economy will be devastating. This will be a very sad day for Hatteras Island if the environmentalists get their way.

Correspondence ID: 13471 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 08:19:01

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Regarding the off road vehicle rules for Cape Hatteras National Park I wish to register my strong objection to allowing vehicles on our beaches. The beach has become just another road because we allow vehicles on them. If people want to fish than they can walk and carry their gear just as people have always done. Vehicles on the beach are dirty ,spilling oil and gas, encouraging trash , the noise and exhaust fumes destroy the beach experience. The beach is for the public and should be for ALL the people yet special interest groups make this beach unsafe for families, for children playing and for those of us who go to the beach to escape the noise of our cities. As a Psychologist I often recommend to patients to spend time at the beach as a means of stress reduction, lowering blood pressure and improving well being. This peace is destroyed by cars and trucks driving past. I cannot hear the birds or the waves from the traffic on the beach. Please get the vehicles back on the pavement and off OUR beaches. Victoria schindler PhD

Correspondence ID: 13472 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 08:19:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the size of the buffers proposed on pages 121 to 127 of the document, and with the inflexibility of the closures. I suggest a maximum of 250 meters or less for all buffers, with "pass through only" corridors to provide ORV and pedestrian access at all times. These pass through corridors work well at the Cape Lookout seashore at South Core Banks.
 I disagree with the decision by NPS to not thoroughly consider the benefit to wildlife of the spoil and dredge islands near the CHNSRA (page 124.) These areas should be considered.
 I strongly agree with the continued prohibition of camping on the beaches.
 I disagree with the complete prohibition of pets during the bird nesting times, especially in front of the villages. (Page 136.) Pets should be permitted on the beach and other areas during these times if kept on a short leash of 6 to 12 feet.
 I disagree with the extent of the restrictions on the Species Management Areas (SMAs) on page 468. The ML1 alternative is far too restrictive. ORV passthrough corridors and pedestrian bypasses should be provided during all of the breeding and nesting season to provide continuing access at all times.
 Thank you for your hard work on this difficult document!

Correspondence ID: 13473 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:20:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I can empathize with those who wish to preserve our beaches. What needs to be considered, however, is how well we will be able to preserve our beaches when there is an economic crisis. Cape Hatteras survives because it has beautiful beaches and is very family-oriented for vacationers. If we have no beach access, we have no vacationers who support those who pay the taxes. With fewer taxes due to homes sold or foreclosed and businesses closing, the Park Services employee payroll will be decreased. The solution is not to close the beaches, but to educate the public on how to respect and preserve what they pay to enjoy. Implementing very strict laws and penalties would deter those who disrespect the coastal habitat. Asking the public to become involved and reporting those they see breaking the law would promote ownership to the majority who respect the environment and the law. This would also be an investment for our future. It will educate our children and adults so man will learn how to live with nature without destroying it. It will become a normal way of life, which is the ultimate goal.

Correspondence ID: 13474 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:20:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It is a tragic, tragic thing to me that ORVs should be allowed on Cape Hatteras beaches at all. We live in an era of burgeoning human population, of infatuation with self-serving entertainment, and of growing autism toward the natural world. Sea turtles are ancient creatures of a vast world outside man. Their nesting is arduous and they deserve complete protection from our cluelessness. Canoeing halfway down the Florida coast on a long Everglades trip, I encountered one as we crossed a white-capped bay. It was an electrifying experience I would hope and pray my grandchildren might experience for themselves. Moreover, our shorebirds are in decline, migration becomes more difficult every year due to loss of habitat, and these birds too deserve a place to rest and rejuvenate. Please limit to the greatest extent possible vehicle access to Cape Hatteras beaches. I was born in a different era, when national lands actually provided refuge to the beleaguered wildlife that desperately needed them. Please keep the national park aspect alive in Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13475 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:21:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
 This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
 The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
 *Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
 * Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
 * Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13476 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: dreyer, diana y
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Mike Murray, Supt. Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
 Supt. Murray:
 Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
 Review of the NPS DEIS document provokes disagreement with the six alternatives appearing there among many concerned Hatteras Island aficionados, myself included.
 That said, the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access position Statement, a document signed by several groups involved in the negotiated rule-making process, successfully provides alternatives for quality visitor experiences, simultaneously protecting fragile natural resources.
 Please consider all aspects of these alternatives, enabling those directly involved back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore, as opposed to those who've never experienced the numerous pleasures of the Hatteras experience. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Diana Dreyer

Correspondence ID: 13477 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:21:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13478 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13479 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:21:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13480 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Eubank, Christine

Received: May,11,2010 08:25:19

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

Dear Sir: My family and I have been coming to the Cape Hatteras shore line for over twenty years now. We normally stay in Ocracoke or Hatteras village. We started coming to this area to enjoying the recreational sport of surf fishing. We do not like standing on a pier or riding in a boat, and appreciate the combination of being able to fish while the kids play in the sand or along the edge of the water (more so when they were younger). We have seen significant changes in beach access especially in the last few years. These closures have dramatically limited large areas of the best fishing areas - at the ends, or points, along the islands. There have always been areas that are off limits and it would seem to me that if you allowed the access that has always been that the birds are smart enough to stay away from vehicles and have their nests in a nonactive area. By closing the beaches you give the birds, both endangered and non-endangered, the ability/opportunity to continue to expand their nesting grounds. At what point will the entire coast be closed to people so the birds can enjoy it? I do not think the birds should take precedent over the people of our state, and the visitors from other states, that come here to enjoy our coastline. In addition. I think that limiting the amount of closures protects the way of life for the residents of the area that count on the income from the visitors. Lastly, after reading some of the Impact Statement I must comment on how ridiculous it is to consider non-threatened and federally listed species in the same light. Obviously, if these birds were not in abundance they would also be on in the federal list, and to treat them as the same does not make any sense at all. In closing, all I can say is that I think the beaches and natural resources of North Carolina are for the enjoyment of their residents. I believe there are enough dunes and nonactive areas already set aside for the wildlife that the closures of key fishing areas should not be allowed. Again, at what point does/would it stop? I appreciate your acknowledgment of my concerns. Sincerely, Christine Eubank

Correspondence ID: 13481 Project: 10641 Document: 32596 Private: Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence:

My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledged rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreation Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan

section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "?prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation home as our pet home encompasses about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs. 15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you, Stephanie Cunningham

Correspondence ID: 13482 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Astle, William & Sallye
Received: May,11,2010 08:32:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

We fully and completely "DISAGREE" with the approach being taken by the NPS on the Off Road Vehicle Management Plan. We are both Senior Citizens who own a small home here in Rodanthe. We purchased our home here that takes us 3 days to drive here to enjoy. Part of the reason that we did such, was because of the beauty and freedoms allowed here. These freedoms and rights should not be so severely restricted that individuals rights are forgotten about.

We do not personally drive on the beach, even though we sully approve and respect the rights to so such. We live right on the beach, and we have met more kind and respectful people who do such when coming here to fish and enjoy the habitat that is here. They do not come to destroy the beauty and animals that are here. By imposing the plan F that the NPS is thinking of imposing, would take away the rights and privlges that everyone has appreciated and enjoyed.

It is beyond our comprehension as to the limits suggested by the NPS that you would like to institute. Why must these limits preclude and severely limit the individuals rights to beach activity through ORV useage, and individual access?

We feel that the NPS MUST address to a greater satisfaction, the preservation of the cultural resources and required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

In a time when this country of America is being driven further and further into a severe economic recession/depression, why on earth would the NPS not consider the economic impact this Plan F would have? Being a banker and Bank Chief Executive Officer for over 40 years, I fully and completely can see from your plan that it will severely impact the economic and social impact of this plan. The answer given by the US Park Service of "business will have to adapt to the new rules" is foolish and an example of how government sometimes is not realistic and insensitive to the public's best interests. Doesn't government care if individuals lose work and individual business concerns go broke?

TO CONCLUDE, AGAIN WE DISAGREE WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS AND ANY OTHER PLAN THAT TAKES HUNDREDS AND HUNDREDS OF PAGES TO STATE IT'S IRECTIVE, THEREBY HIDING AND COVERING OVER THE REAL DESIRE OF THE DOCUMENT. PLEASE DO NOT TAKE AWAY INDIVIDUAL FREEDOMS AND RIGHTS BY LESISLATING THE DESIRE OF THE FEW AND ABUSING AND SESTROYING THE RIGHTS OF THE MANY WHOM IT WILL AFFECT.

THANY YOU FOR YOUR TIME, AND WE SINCERELY HOPE THAT THIS RESPONSE WILL NOT BE PIGEN HOLLED, AND THAT WE ARE JUST AS IMPORTANT AND SOME OF THOSE ORGANIZATIOSN THAT ARE PRESSING FOR OUR RIGHTS TO BE TAKEN AWAY.
William and Sallye Astle

Correspondence ID: 13483 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 08:34:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been spending time on the OBX of North Carolina for the past eight years for business and pleasure. The new regulations are going to strangle the businesses and force the human population off the island. The effects are already appearant in the rental businesses, and the retail stores. If you continue to keep people from enjoying the ammenities of the island, like the beaches, then they will stop going to the islands entirely.

Correspondence ID: 13484 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:37:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan
 We have enjoyed Cape Hatteras for over 25 years and have purchased a rental home in 1991 to have a place where the family can go to vacation. Part of being able to afford the second home can only be accomplished through renting the house out 6 months out of the year. Part of the rentals come from the windsurfers and kite boarders, but the other portion is from the fisherman that come for the fishing tournaments. Closing off the beaches is detrimental to the local economy. If we lose anymore rentals, we will have to sell the house as we cannot afford it. We keep a book in the house for the guests to write up their weeks stay and there are plenty of entries discussing the driving on the beach for day trips and picnic events. There are plenty more discussing the fishing and convenience of driving on the beach and having everything needed available in the trucks verses having to go back to the house to get it. Like previously stated, we have been going to the island for over 25 years, and we have seen the nesting grounds blocked off for the birds and the turtles and that is part of the island charm and environmental consciousness that we love. We as a family feel that there has to be a give and take through compromise involved inorder to make this decision. I have seen some statistics, and I am concerned that if the beaches get closed, there will be a more detrimental impact to the economy of the island then there would be coming from a compromise to keep the beaches open.
Thank you for taking the time to consider the Taylor family views and concerns.

Correspondence ID: 13485 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Salyers, Rebecca C
Received: May,11,2010 08:37:42
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Superintendent Murray:
 I am writing in opposition to the ORV DEIS. I completely disagree with the excessive measures that would be taken should Alternative F be instated in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, and I urge you to come to a compromise with the requests of the Coalition for Beach Access.
 The ORV routes designated in Alternative F are discriminatory against numerous visitors and residents of Dare County. Those individuals who are handicapped or elderly will have restricted access to some of the most pristine areas of the seashore. Walking long distances in the sand is not an option for individuals in such conditions. Families with small children and fishermen with their daily supplies will also be adversely affected by the restrictions on ORV routes.
 I disagree with total restriction of Species Management Areas. I ask that there be a bypass of these areas that runs either around or below the high tide line. This is the only way to ensure that beach access is maintained.
 I also believe that the turtle closures are extreme. I oppose the around the clock closure from nest to surfline and the size of the turtle closure buffers. I agree with the Coalition for Beach Access in their request to have the buffers run from nest to surfline from one hour before sunset until dawn. To have this area closed during the day when turtles will not be hatching is unnecessary. I also strongly disagree with the size of the buffers and feel that they should only surround the turtle nest during the daylight hours. The National Park Service has an established Turtle Night Nest Watch Program which has proved to be effective in the past.
 The regulations of pets in the seashore as stated in Alternative F are extremely excessive. I support the idea that pets should be required to stay on a leash at all times while in the park. Alternative F calls for prohibition of pets on beaches, campgrounds, soundside areas, foot trails, and all park maintained roads. This is again discriminatory against a set of our seashores visitors. Pet owners will feel greatly alienated when visiting the park.
 The ORV DEIS is severe and will greatly affect the visitor's experience to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore as well as the livelihood and culture of the residents of Dare County. I ask that you reject the proposed DEIS and consider the requests of the Coalition for Beach Access.
 Sincerely,
 Rebecca Conner Salyers Conner's Supermarket

Correspondence ID: 13486 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:39:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not believe that there should be any off-road recreational vehicles in any public park or space devoted to nature conservation. The idea of people on quads ripping up beaches and parks to the detriment of the landscape and the ability of others to enjoy nature is absurd. The pollution, noise and destruction inherent in the use of off-road vehicles should make this a non-issue. Is this country in a race to destroy the environment and use up all the fossil fuels we can possibly burn as quickly as possible? The availability of joy-rides to the few is of no value to the public or the environment whatsoever.

Correspondence ID: 13487 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 08:40:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The area around the Cape Hatteras light is fragile...hence the reason they had to move the light. I think motorized vehicles should not be permitted on the shore.

Correspondence ID: 13488 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: White, Travis L
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: On behalf of Southland Trade Corporation an employer of over 100 in Currituck County NC along the busy HWY 168 corridor leading to and from the Outer Banks, we are opposed to further restriction, closures, penalties, on off road vehicle use on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. As a small business welcoming the Outer Banks visitors each year we can certainly sympathize with our Dare County neighbors and businesses in this fight against the strong arm of the environmentalists. These businesses depend on and thrive off of the visitors to the Hatteras seashore, its beauty, and pristine condition, but also its accessibility. It is the accessibility, that if further restricted, will continue to negatively impact the small businesses and its employees that support families off the attraction to the seashore and its surroundings. Make no doubt about it. There is an economic handicap with restriction to vehicles on the seashore. It already has already been a misfortunate decision. In business, decisions are based on facts and figures. We suggest that comparative data be released or studied on the Currituck Refuge area on the Northern beaches of the Outer Banks where driving is unregulated and further consider the impact that this has on the wildlife in question and if driving does indeed continue to be regulated, it be to the satisfaction of both parties involved.

Correspondence ID: 13489 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Plotsky, Nancy N
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I own two rental houses in Avon and am very worried about the impact of this project on the well-being of the vacation industry on hatteras island, and the restrictions set forth to keep humans off the beaches, and enjoying the natural parks on the island. Cutting off access to the beaches would be unfair to those of us who have invested heavily in the area. Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed. It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date. The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit." Thank you, David & Nancy Plotsky Vacation Homeowners Specifically: Page 201: I have been told that Piping Plover deaths have not been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. Page xxiv: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and certainly diminished visitor and homeowner experience. Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access. Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS. I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%, So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles. Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues. pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages ? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts. ? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

David & Nancy Plotsky 202-425-4907

Correspondence ID: 13490 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Midgett, Beth
Received: May, 11, 2010 08:42:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am writing you today to make formal comments on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement, specifically Alternative F, created by the National Park Service with input from the negotiated rulemaking advisory committee. I wish to thank the National Park Service for an opportunity to comment on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore ORV Management Plan DEIS. As a concerned Hatteras Island citizen whose family income is dependent solely on tourism, I feel it is my professional and civic duty to make timely comment on a matter that affects millions of citizens who wish to visit and have access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

The Midgett family has lived on the Outer Banks for at least three centuries, and today's Midgetts are descendants of the tough, independent seafaring men and women who managed to thrive and survive on these isolated barrier islands. The Midgett tradition of commitment and serving others has deep roots. In the 1800's, the men of the Midgett family were known as leaders in the US Lifesaving Service. Their selfless actions earned the men a record number of 10 Lifesaving Medals of Honor, a record that stands unsurpassed today in the history of the Lifesaving Service, and the US Coast Guard. My father-in-law and his brother were the operators of the famous Hatteras Island - Manteo Bus Line, which carried islanders and visitors up and down the beach in the days before roads and bridges.

I am in support of Alternative A (the Interim Plan). Under the plan there was negligible economic impact, however, there was an increase in piping plovers that was clearly demonstrated by increased numbers in 2007 and in 2008. In the latter year, the Consent Decree went into effect but not until after the nesting season was underway. In 2009, the first full year under the decree, the numbers actually declined. This alternative was based on science and balanced access by the public with protection of the wildlife.

In my opinion, National Park Service is appearing to shift its dual mandate of providing for the protection of the natural resources and wildlife while simultaneously providing for the public's right to current and future recreational opportunities (access) to a policy of denying human entry into large areas of the park and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach. As currently structured, Alternative F is not primarily an ORV management plan. It is primarily a public access restriction plan. The plan is biased toward bird and turtle protection, seashore isolation and not to a reasonable extent on public use and visitor access?specifically ORV and pedestrian access. There is room for both public use and resource management.

Comment 1:

I am distrustful of the bird counts used as a basis for the protective measures. I have grave concerns that all birds in the ecosystem are not being considered in the management plan. Currently, birds on dredge spoil islands located adjacent to the Park are not being included in the population figures. The North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission is on record that they are agreement that these islands have no predation and are ideal

locations for nesting. Additionally, Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge is managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service separately from the Park Service management of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. But the refuge is located on Hatteras Island within the seashore. The bird activity within the refuge should be tracked and included in the target productivity levels. Fluctuations and trends in Recreational Area bird populations should be viewed relative to regional and state experiences not in isolation. To not include the populations of these islands and the Refuge is disingenuous to the intent of this process and is one of the reasons I am distrustful of the integrity of this process.

Comment 2:

Birds listed as North Carolina species of concern should not be given protected status under the Endangered Species Act. It is my understanding that both the Chairman and Executive Director of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission have informed you that these unnecessary protections were never the intent of the Commission's participation in this process, nor a requested outcome. They also have stated that other species of concern are not given ESA status on other federal lands. Pre-nesting closures should be exclusively for the piping plover; the only federally listed threatened bird species. Also, non-ESA listed birds should not have buffers of 300 meters.

The following is an excerpt from a May 9, 2010 Virginian-Pilot news article by Catherine Kozak: Numerous shorebirds in Cape Hatteras National Seashore are given higher levels of protection in a proposed off-road vehicle management plan than what the law ever intended the birds to have, a state wildlife official said. State-listed "species of concern," - such as the American oystercatcher - do not require the extensive buffers and beach closures mandated for federally listed species such as the piping plover, said Gordon Myers, the executive director of the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission. Myers said that's beyond the intent of the state law: the state designation is supposed to be more of a call to action for a species. The Wildlife Resource Commission, he said, will voice its objections to the use of state "species of concern" lists to trigger ORV management strategies under the federal Endangered Species Act. That is of concern to us because it's apples and oranges," he said. "To treat it as synonymous with threatened and endangered is not congruent."

Again, the misuse of data is disingenuous to the intent of this process and is yet another one of the reasons I am distrustful of the integrity of this process.

Comment 3:

Nowhere in the DEIS is it mentioned that protected species populations are growing without the needs of additional restrictions such as those of consent decree and Alternative F.

Published USFWS data suggests that the piping plover is "recovering" well beyond 1986 levels and do not suggest that additional restrictions beyond regional recovery plans are necessary or essential at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area for the continued recovery of the species.

Piping Plover--Atlantic Coast Pairs

Year 1986 1999 2005 2006 2007 Nesting Pairs (est.) 790 1386 1632 1749 1880

<http://www.fws.gov/northeast/pipingplover/index.html>

Comment 4:

A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions of an unfledged piping plover chick represents 771 acres of closed beach. This seems a bit arbitrary and capricious when managing a species. I have yet to read any scientific reasoning behind this management strategy. It is my understanding that in Assateague Island National Seashore the buffer is 300 meters. Why is the 1,000 meter buffer being proposed for CHNSRA? Why is one National Seashore being treated so differently than others when we are at the extreme southernmost extremity of the nesting area? A much smaller buffer would be just as effective for the survival of a piping plover chick without the extreme penalization of the residents and visitors of Hatteras Island.

Comment 5:

In the past during a closure, the NPS and our State government were able to work with you and your staff to create corridors around resource closures. These alternative paths are indispensable to the continued movement of pedestrians and vehicles. Also, the corridors allow visitors to access an open area that may be sandwiched between two closed areas. These corridors have limited negative impacts to the protected species, but they are crucial to providing access during closure periods. I stand with Dare County and our North Carolina state government in requesting that corridors be maintained for pedestrians and vehicles in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season.

Comment 6:

It appears as if the preferred alternative prohibits pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages. This means no pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, sound front, foot trails, and park maintained roads from March 15 ?July 31. If this is a correct interpretation, I am totally opposed. I support the previous leash law (all pets must be on a leash 6 feet or less in length).

Comment 7:

Alternative F will significantly change the economy and unique culture of the Outer Banks. The DEIS has failed to properly assess those changes. The Economic Impact Analysis found the DEIS by its own admission is incomplete. How can I comment on an incomplete document? The Economic analysis is structured in such a manner that it fails to address full costs?direct costs, indirect costs, lost opportunity costs, costs of future liability, and hidden costs.

The Economic Analysis fails to recognize that the national seashore environment is a unique form of capital that serves the local economy, and in turn the health and well being of citizens and families that depend of that economy. Access to the seashore is essential for family business operations on the Outer Banks. In our family business, vacation rentals, the spring rental season has been decimated by the beach closures brought about by the consent decree. The demographics of the spring guests have been traditionally fishermen and they are unwilling to risk sending money on a vacation when the beach access is so untenable.

The cost to society and the local communities under the restrictive consent decree has now been extended indefinitely into Alternative F. Economic losses in millions of dollars have occurred to island businesses especially motels, campgrounds, restaurants and tackle shops. The full costs of Alternative F are very much understated in the DEIS. Annual economic losses under the consent decree are already in excess of those estimated by Research Triangle Institute.

It is my understanding that the Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce, on behalf of its more than 1,000 members with businesses in Dare, Hyde and Currituck counties, has gone on record as vehemently disagreeing with the validity of the economic impact analysis included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for proposed new rules for access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

This group of professional business owners states unequivocally states "Not only does the analysis not adequately convey the economic impact of the proposed Alternative F, it fails to address any of the alternatives listed in the DEIS. The data is incomplete, misleading and the statements of what are supposed to be facts are without sound basis."

Comment 8:

If I understand the document correctly, it would appear as if the DEIS proposes to close the beaches at Hatteras Inlet, both the South Tip of Hatteras Island and the North tip of Ocracoke Island permanently and year-round. Aside from the fact that such a closure would forever alter the traditional uses of these areas, such a closure has already and will impact the public safety of mariners traversing the inlet. On Saturday, May 1st 2010, an inshore charter boat overturned in Hatteras Inlet. There were 6 occupants of the boat, all family members, 3 children and 3 adults. The captain was a professional charter captain. They spent 4 hours in the water awaiting rescue. They could have been seen from the beach, had it been open but instead had to wait until the offshore charter fleet was returning in late day for any hopes of being rescued. One of the group died as a result.

Comment 9:

The final subject I wish to comment on is a bit more personal in nature. I am overwhelmingly appalled and bitterly disillusioned in the National Park Service and our Federal government for allowing this entire issue to get so out of hand. I feel strongly that the enabling legislation for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational area has been violated. Furthermore, as a member of a family who has called Hatteras Island home for over three centuries and has been a steward of the Island for just as long, the government considers us to be "visitors" to the Seashore, having no more rights than a non United States citizen!

Native Hatteras Islanders and visitors were deeply concerned when the federal government was creating the recreational Seashore in 1937, ? and rightly so ? that government involvement would interfere with the public's enjoyment of and access to the beaches of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. It was an incredible relief that the Park Service and the Department of the Interior were willing to work so closely and cooperatively with the local community to address these concerns. In fact, in 1952 during discussions of adjusting the boundaries of the Seashore, Park Service Director Conrad Wirth wrote an open letter to the people of the Outer Banks reassuring them that the beaches would continue to be open for their use, stating, "?when the lands for the

Recreational Area are acquired and become public property there will always be access to the beach for all people, whether they are local residents or visitors from the outside."

The Federal government knowingly fully encompassed the existing villages of Hatteras Island upon creation of the Recreational Seashore. When the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area was formed, the National Park Service stressed to the local residents in 1949 that this park would be an economic asset to the villages located within the park's boundaries. In 1952, Park Superintendent Conrad Wirth wrote that the park and its staff would "bring enjoyment to millions of visitors and prosperity to you."

We, the native people of the islands were asked by the government to be the host to the nation and the world at the seashore. Our family responded to that call from our government. We now own the largest natively owned vacation rental company on the island, we own a motel, real estate business, two marinas and a restaurant. Now, because we responded to that call of duty we are in jeopardy of losing all we have worked for?.for ourselves and future generations?.being put in jeopardy by the very same entity that called us to duty.

Thank you again for allowing the submission of comments. I leave you with the words of Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes from 1938.

"When we look up and down the ocean fronts of America, we find that everywhere they are passing behind the fences of private ownership. The people can no longer get to the ocean. When we have reached the point that a nation of 125 million people cannot set foot upon the thousands of miles of beaches that border the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, except by permission of those who monopolize the ocean front, then I say it is the prerogative and the duty of the Federal and State Governments to step in and acquire, not a swimming beach here and there, but solid blocks of ocean front hundreds of miles in length. Call this ocean front a national park, or a national seashore, or a state park or anything you please?I say that the people have a right to a fair share of it."

Sincerely, Beth Midgett

Beth Midgett PO Box 250 Hatteras, NC 27943

Correspondence ID: 13491 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Lyon, John F

Received: May,11,2010 08:44:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern,

I have been fishing on the outer banks all my life and its a tradition I would like to pass on to my offspring's offspring. I truly believe that the fishermen and can cohabitate with the native birds without stressing them. At my home in the cities and towns we all cohabitate with many birds and they seem to thrive just fine. In fact I hear them singing out my door as I write this note. Also, food and water is available at my house year round for any bird. I believe animals are very resilient and can adapt to any situation because they have been doing it for thousands of years and definitely as long as man has fished the outerbanks. I hope whoever makes this decision about the beach access really thinks about the impact it will have to our way of life in North Carolina. Thanks for your cosideration.

Sincerely,

John Lyon

Correspondence ID: 13492 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Jennette, Dee

Received: May,11,2010 08:44:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a native of Hatteras Island and a business owner. I strongly disagree with the closures of our beaches. Due to the economic crisis we have been through and are still going through,my business is extremely down and if you close our beaches that will certainly add to the problem in a serious matter. Tourist have come into my store and strongly commented that they will never come back here if our beaches are closed to vehicles and pedestricians. We, the people on Hatteras Island cannot survive without tourism. My business depends on the people which own rental houses and if tourist are not here to rent the cottages then I am out of business. Please consider the devastation that will occur if we cannot depend on these people coming to our beautiful Island to vacation.

Correspondence ID: 13493 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 08:45:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments

My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a

way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial

Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events.

Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

When on Hatteras Island we have always gotten together on the South Beach to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules.

(p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 13494 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:46:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not restrict dogs (pets) on beach during certain time periods. We keep our dogs on leash for beach walks. One of the main reasons we visit Avon, NC is the option to take our family pets on vacation with us.

Correspondence ID: 13495 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hall, Herman
Received: May,11,2010 08:46:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please come up with a solution that protects wildlife effectively while maintaining open beach access for recreational purposes. Thanks.

Correspondence ID: 13496 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments
My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.
4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."
However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)
5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.
Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.
6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.
I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.
Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.
The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.
Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.
NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access

to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues. When on Hatteras Island we have always gotten together on the South Beach to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fishermen want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow

beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.
18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 13497 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Doherty, David
Received: May,11,2010 08:49:21
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am defending the position that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore should remain as accessible as possible for ORVs. I have lived in the area prior to my move to Illinois and I continue to take vacations to the outer banks area. I am an avid surfer and I can say that ORV access is a consideration in choosing to vacation in the outer banks, especially having the ability to enjoy the seashore and drive along to areas where I can surf alone. I also believe that curtailing ORV will severely limit access to the beaches given the lack of adequate parking facilities along the main highway on Hatteras Island. I appreciate the position of conservationists who are trying to protect wildlife, but it seems to me that the unique nature of the island resulting in lack of adequate means of access without ORVs would pretty much cut off a substantial amount of recreational use on the seashore at the expense of a conservation movement. I am surprised that additional reviews are not being considered to explore measures to accommodate all parties. Like most surfers I appreciate nature and enjoy surfing in a natural environment but the proposed ORV restrictions seem extreme and will act to cut-off the park from public use, not promote it.

Correspondence ID: 13498 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Barton, William F
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: ORV traffic is devastating habitat and tranquility in way to many our our precious parks and natural areas. We need to be especially careful with our disappearing wetlands. Beside protect wetlands from the hardcore mudders we need to educate the novice and casual users to the damage they can cause.
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association, Izaak Walton League of America, Sierra Club, and Save Our Creeks and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 13499 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:51:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: persons that have never been to the HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA should not have any say in the mamagement of the recreation area. their are too many people wanting to control what others do, based on their own beliefs.

Correspondence ID: 13500 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:51:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please preserve reasonable and safe access to the beach for recreational purposes and without harming the biota found on the Seashore. My family and I very much enjoy the Seashore and cherish having access to surf fishing on the Outer Banks. This has been a loved family tradition of ours and for many others that would be a tragedy to lose.
Regards,
William L. Smith Jr

Correspondence ID: 13501 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:51:57
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: 13502 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. .
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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, personally do not agree that ORV's should ever be allowed on the parts of beaches that would endanger wildlife. We are losing too much ground to personal recreation, not only here but all over the world. Thank you for listening

Correspondence ID: 13503 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:52:25
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: 13504 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:52:25
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: 13505 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments
My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors." However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%, So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues. When on Hatteras Island we have always gotten together on the South Beach to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period

we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules.

(p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fishermen want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 to July 31.

Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 to 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 to September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Correspondence ID: 13506 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 08:53:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray, I have recently become aware that the National Park Service is on the verge of approving an Off Road Vehicle management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I cannot begin to express my disappointment in the lack of consideration for the wildlife and pedestrian visitors. This initiative will only disrupt the natural environment and the beauty of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Off Road Vehicles will only bring noise and disrupt wildlife. People that visit National Parks do so to get away from the noise and pollution of everyday life. How is it possible to allow this type "recreation" into this peaceful environment. I am distraught by the National Parks Service consideration of the use of ORV.

This shows lack of common sense and management skills.

Correspondence ID:	13507	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Peters, Steve					
Received:	May,11,2010 08:55:28					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I strongly support limiting ORV from the Hatteras Seashore. This traffic is very disruptive to other people who are there to enjoy the area. Individuals who drive on the beach have demonstrated little regard for the area, let alone other people.					
Correspondence ID:	13508	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,11,2010 08:55:59					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	There is a strong community of watersports enthusiasts living in the outer banks and a large majority of visitors to the island that come solely to enjoy the park and the waters and beaches. Keeping the beaches open to those people who drive hundreds of miles to come visit multiple times every year, and those who after visiting have decided to live is imperative to keep this access available. I strongly suggest that you keep all these people in mind and the impact it will have on their lives and the livelihood of the people living on the island.					
Correspondence ID:	13509	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Ruckdeschel, Jenny					
Received:	May,11,2010 08:57:25					
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:	13510	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,11,2010 08:57:53					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV. Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures. In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.					
Correspondence ID:	13511	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Bamford, Sherman					
Received:	May,11,2010 08:59:40					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	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. Piping Plovers, American Oystercatchers, and endangered sea turtles that have been threatened for too long by unregulated off-road vehicles (ORVs) at Cape Hatteras. Cape Hatteras has been required for decades under federal law to establish ORV guidelines that minimize harm to wildlife and natural values of the Seashore in accordance with the best available science. 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. 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.					
Correspondence ID:	13512	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Lauder, Theresa					
Received:	May,11,2010 09:00:02					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles based on peer reviewed science. Who better to advocate preservation of area wildlife than the					

0012535

people whose lives and futures are intertwined to the success of each species.

I own property in Salvo NC, and walk and drive on the beach for surfing, windsurfing and enjoyment of the National Seashore. The only way my elderly parents can get to the National Seashore beachfront is by driving to the beach. (As well as all residents and visitors that may use wheelchairs) The community of homeowners in our neighborhood are stewards of the National Seashore and the beach area in our Village. We often spend our time picking up trash and cleaning the beach area. The users of the beach, surfers, wind & Kite boarders, fisherman and beach lovers are all committed to balancing resource protection and providing reasonable access for recreation.

I AGREE WITH THE 4 ITEMS LISTED BELOW REGARDING THE DEIS Alternative F, the one considered by the National Park Service as their preferred alternative: CORRIDORS are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on peer-reviewed science NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation and other practices

And I also agree that the following questions must be researched and incorporated in the standards for beach access. Do vibrations in the sand affect incubation or hatchlings? At what distance can emerging hatchlings hear a passing car? At what distance can emerging hatchlings feel a car pass at 15 mph? And, does either of these events alter their activity? How far away does a stationary light source have to be disorienting (We were told a moving light is not as disorienting as stationary light)

Correspondence ID: 13513 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:00:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: i hope that driving on ALL north carolina beaches will be banned - too many times i have seen people in jeopardy because the driver of a vehicle was inconsiderate or reckless -
the beach is a place to bring children to play and not have to worry about them being run over by a careless driver - i understand preventing an accident on the highway but a person should not have to watch to prevent a truck accident on the beach !
if you want to drive: do it on the highway or a race track -
the beach is NOT a roadway !
also, there is erosion to consider when a vehicle is driven on the beach & sometimes the vehicles have oil leaks -
thank you for allowing my comments -

Correspondence ID: 13514 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lifsey, John
Received: May,11,2010 09:02:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with DEIS alternative F. I believe it to be excessive and unreasonable. I am in complete agreement with the Dare County Board of Commissioners support of open and accessible beaches for Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I disagree specifically with alternative "F" position that there would be little economic impact. To the contrary, beach closures have already had a definite negative impact on the economy of Hatteras Island and any additional restrictions would be nothing short of severe. I disagree with alternative "F" allowance for 1000 meter buffers for the unfledged piping plover chick, there is no scientific reasoning for this excessive amount of area. I believe that a 200 meter buffer would be arguable sufficient. I strongly believe that corridors are absolutely necessary to allow passage to open areas. I also believe there is no purpose to give endangered species protective status. This just enlarges closed areas for no reason. I support the relocation of sea turtle nests as a ways of their management.

Correspondence ID: 13515 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:04:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to comment on the draft ORV plan for the Cape Hatteras seashore. Of the 6 plans presented in the draft plan I am most pleased with plan D. This plan is the most predictable option and restricts driving on the beach to the greatest extent. I wish, however, that a plan was presented that restricted driving on the beach to a greater extent than has been proposed in any of the 6 plans. My preference would be that driving (at all times of the year) was restricted to a small proportion of the beach (perhaps 10 miles in total). At the same time I think the greatest possible beach should be open to pedestrian traffic. The park service should encourage pedestrian visits rather than ORV visits to the beach by providing more walking paths to the beach at the same time closing driving access.

Correspondence ID: 13516 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 1. Page 201: I disagree with the statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk."
There have been no Piping Plover deaths have actually been linked to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve.
2. Page xix and page 23: I disagree with having the two different closures rules for to the North facing beaches and the South facing beaches as the grid outlines in Alternative "F". I am also against the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches.
3. Page 1: I do agree with the statement that "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."
4. Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is not practical to have someone transport disabled person to the beach and then turn around the vehicle park at the street or parking area. This requires the disabled person to have a driver. What if the disabled person can drive by themselves and wants to go to the beach when unable to find a driver- they are stuck because they are disabled? It also requires the driver hike distance from the parking area to the place that the disabled person was dropped off and to top it off then the driver has to hike the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.
5. Page 121 ? 127. I totally disagree with the buffers that are currently being presented. There have to be pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. The problem is if you close off the access on one side of a 3 mile beach stretch and close off access on the other side of the 3 mile beach stretch while you provide no corridor- what you have really done is closed 3 miles of the beach. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is too large and not based upon reviewed science. A more reasonable distance is 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Sufficient scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.
6. Page 124: I disagree with the NPS attitude of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches.
7. I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. The policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival. Example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events such as the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3% - these are your own stats! So basically the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles- JUST 3%!
8. I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park. The NPS does not properly consider locations near the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem such as Dredge and Spoil Island. These birds in these areas are part of the same ecosystem and should be included in

the NPS stats.

9. Page 1: The DEIS does not responsibly address the cultural resource issues. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" is in the first sentence of the first page of the plan. However, in the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

10. Pages 270-281 & 561-598: I disagree with the economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) includes the Northern Beaches- Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are totally separate from Hatteras Island ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

11. I strongly disagree with the statement on Page xlvi: Alternative F is listed as having a "negligible to moderate" negative impact on small businesses. Beach closures have already had a devastating impact on many Dare County Businesses.

12. Page 136: I very strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages". The ban on pets will not only effect the lifestyles of our locals include my family but it will also great hurt the tourism as pet travel is a big market that we currently attract. It is reasonable to allow pets on 6 foot leashes all year in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

13. Pages 125 & 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and proposed procedures. It is reasonable to think that endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices currently being used at other federal seashores. These other federal seashores are more proactive towards achieving nesting success. Example of proactive behavior- relocating nests to more desirable locations which is currently done in other state and federally controlled areas. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost edge of turtle nesting locations, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. The proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and they amount to overprotection.

14. Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section which prohibits ORVs year round between ramps 27 and 30, Hatteras Inlet, Ocracoke Inlet and other locations. Not allowing ORV access is denying the public access to these beaches. These areas are too far from parking and paved areas to access them on foot.

15. Page 104: I strongly disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. The proposal forces visitors off of the beaches early and prevents surf fishermen access in the early morning.

16. Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access March 15 to July 31 in eight different locations. Please leave these areas open!

Correspondence ID: 13517 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:06:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I don't even know where to begin. I have lived on the Outer Banks my entire life and never thought that there would be a day where I was told I couldn't drive/walk down to the beach and have a picnic. How can this be stopped? I enjoy our beaches for beach combing, fishing, sunning, and most of all relaxation with my family. Where will the visitors go when they come for vacation or will they just stop coming? Please help keep our beaches open and let me know what I can do to help.
 Thanks.
 Annah Petty

Correspondence ID: 13518 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Allen, Glen B
Received: May,11,2010 09:07:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The DEIS is a major failure. Years of preparing for this moment and NPS does not even have the integrity to bring forth a plan which both provides resource protection and provides for recreational access. The DEIS greatest flaw comes from its bias and its very weak attempt to rationalize a position of non access through resource management.
 No outreach or education was offered to my community and most were not qualified to respond to 900 or so pages of the DEIS. It should be well noted that after all of these years of hearing about the so-called other side of this issue and how many people are allegedly upset and complaining about off road vehicles; that the public meeting attendance had almost no participation by anti-access voices except for paid environmental lawyers and lobbyist (and only a couple of those). The pro-access community was well represented.
 It should also be noted that not one resource violation under the consent decree has harmed the resource in any manner according to Superintendent Murray.
 Turtle nests should be relocated to increase chances of hatching my moving them from likely overwash areas. Even if turtle hatchlings whose nest are moved appear to be less vigorous than unmoved turtle hatchlings, an original site nest which floods and kills all the hatchlings has NO chance. It is really poor management of the ESA to allow the states to manage turtles while allowing thousands of unhatched eggs to be lost.
 The enabling legislation which was decades after the Organic Act is very clear that recreation is the main function of this recreational area. I find it amazing that NPS takes an old act and uses it to supersede what congress wanted and intended. The concept of preserving for future generations public resources would mean a desire to protect cultural and historical use both recreational and other for this area. The DEIS again brings none of this discussion forward. In the enabling legislation were grave concerns and promises made about commercial fishing since it was the only method the islanders had for making a living and so protections were offered. If interpreted correctly, the concerns were for the local citizens to be afforded protection in order to make a living but of course today NPS only looks at commercial fishing and their misinterpretation and their closures do not even take in commercial fishing access.
 The traditional use of the beach and seashore is being completely ignored. While the DEIS tries to give a very mundane oversight of transportation use through out the 1940's and up to today, it fails. CHNRA was one of the very first surf fishing Mecca's in the world. The traditional use of the beach to fish and recreate was and is history. Hunting shorebirds for profit and recreation was also a part of that history. Long before NPS began trying to manage and close the beach the locals were profiting from taking visitors to hunt and fish and to also furnish the same visitors with food and lodging. Both the NC Wildlife Resources Commission and the NC Marine Fisheries Commission with minor reservation are in support of the access point of view. I find it highly disturbing that NPS places such a high priority on the species of concern list generated by North Carolina while the state does not. The list is only there for increased monitoring of the species if needed and no further restrictions are recommended or suggested. I also find it disturbing that NPS picks and chooses its species for regulation from the list.
 Predation, storms, and interference by outside monitors and guest are the real reasons for the lack of birding success in the area. The DEIS continues to promote the theory that there are more vehicles on the beach today than ever before. This is just supposition. The bluefish runs in the early eighties had much greater numbers of people and vehicles on the beach. Hurricane charts mirror the decline of plovers in the nineties but these tables are simply discounted in the DEIS. Predators are now being killed by the thousands and one can only imagine the resurgence of ghost crabs and the harm future generations of plovers will face by this menace. The protocols make reference to 25 predators killed the first year of management that this should help increase bird numbers. I wonder if they ever imagined thousands being killed (sort of like mowing your grass).
 Objective viewing of the birds and their reaction to intrusion by either pedestrian or vehicle shows without question the suggested buffers under alternative F to be vastly too large. Any unbiased person can walk up to an American oyster catcher and note that it is not disturbed until only a few meters away. The same scenario happens while driving slowly past. The number 1, 2, and 3 nesting sites for least terns in this county are on the roofs of various department and grocery stores. Least tern populations are going up year after year and they seem content to nest amongst us. Why the great penalty?
 Bird Populations should be managed by area. I well remember the hysteria brought forth by the plaintiffs about black skimmers being extinct in CHNRA. Oh my God, guess what? They simply moved 500 yards off and on to a spoil site just off the sound in Hatteras. Last year there were 500 or more nest of black skimmers on the north end of Hatteras Island which were not included in NPS reports. If NPS is going to succumb to the lies and

0012537

hype of the environmental lobby; at least try to manage with some kind of honesty.

Turtle management should be maintained by NPS. The great amount of nest lost to water emersion is unacceptable and leads only to questioning why local managers of NPS would listen to one biologist from the state when such vast numbers of eggs are being destroyed. Many years lost eggs account for 50% of the total laid eggs and last year's 37% is a disgrace. The state of South Carolina with a much greater number of nests too manage lost 7% last year. The only clear reason I see for the present management is the bias of the state biologist against vehicle use. By the way, this same biologist did a study (the grant was worth hundreds of thousands of dollars) which showed that moving the nest caused the hatchlings to be less vigorous in his opinion. Of course a dead egg is even less vigorous than a moved egg. It is just ridiculous.

Night time restrictions are again not founded in science but simply in mixing assumptions and then using the mix for a rule. For example, 70% of all turtle nest are in non vehicle areas already. Therefore 30 nest are in vehicle areas and 15 of these will be moved. All of this nighttime closure for the 15 nest out of the 56,000 plus east coast turtle nest. Alternative F recommends night time closure one month before turtles arrive and 3 months after they quit nesting. This is just not acceptable. Not allowing campfires on the open beach but allowing campfires in front of the first row of village rental cottages smacks of pay offs for those same few owners who lobbied for both vehicle and pedestrian access restrictions. The very most basic study of false turtle crawls in closed, open, and village area show no justification for nighttime closure. After all, there never has been a turtle or nest harmed in the area by vehicle nighttime traffic (NPS has no study on use). All of the assumptions made are just that, assumptions.

Flexibility is not being shown in the DEIS. The flexibility for future managers shown in the interim strategy is not shown here. The future will close vast areas to all even though those areas may change and have little benefit to the birds. Today areas are closed which could be open and much criticism of NPS alleviated yet those areas are closed because of inflexible buffers.

The disabled, old, and infirm will pay a great price for the DEIS. Local NPS has neither studies nor inclination to understand its customers and users. Interpreters and managers do not get involved with the public. Sure the fee gathering spots such as the Cape Hatteras Lighthouse and Wright Memorial or even the campgrounds may be easy places to generate information but the beach user is not studied. This does not surprise me since upper management is never seen on Hatteras or Ocracoke Island. There will be a grave injustice done to the handicapped under the DEIS.

Note that Hatteras Island's recession started with the consent decree and not when the rest of the country's recession started. I also grow weary of hearing about how hard this is on NPS. There is not an employee in NPS who has lost a nickel over the consent decree or a night's sleep. The economic harm will be and is in the hundreds of millions of dollars to Dare and Hyde County.

Please address the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area as a RECREATION area.

Correspondence ID: 13519 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:09:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 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.
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,
Kristin Hissong

Correspondence ID: 13520 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:10:22
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: 13521 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Rowe, Bonnie
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Bonnie Rowe PO Box 1283 Buxton, NC 27920

Correspondence ID: 13522 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please accept this letter as my comments on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six

alternatives within the document. The DEIS management alternatives have little to do with developing a responsible off road vehicle management plan. The alternatives map out a plan to exclude humans from the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area. Unless my feet are now classified as off road vehicles, this document is wat off base.

A 1000 meter buffer zone for common shore bird nests ia absolutely absurd. This buffer zone allows a bird nest a circle that cannot be entered by humans that is over a mile across! We do not afford this type of easment to any other animal. We do not provide this much of a buffer zone to the president! It makes no sense what so ever to place the buffer zone around the nests of oyster catchers and terns let alone the misguided plovers that are attempting to nest outside of their natural range.

Another thing that really bothers me is the way the National Park Service is slaughtering mamalian wildlife under the guise of protecting endangered birds. THE BIRDS ARE NOT ENDANGERED! The fact that the park service is deciding which wildlife can live and which species should be irradicated disgusts me.

I have reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process (another travesty) 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 actual people, not lawyers, back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Sincerely,
George W. Sobotka/Briner

Correspondence ID: 13523 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 09:12:24

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

Being a member of the NPC Ass.on I am submitting my comments on the draft plan to manage Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I am concerned that all of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement favors 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. I support Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.

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

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

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

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

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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: 13524 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: dreyer, diana y

Received: May,11,2010 09:13:10

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Mr. Mike Murray, Supt. Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954

Supt. Murray:

Please consider my views on the current ORV DEIS issue.

I agree with rational measures to protect our natural resources. However, the DEIS emphasizes maintenance of natural resources without a voice but glosses over the voices of local human residents and maintenance of their cultural and historic values, not to mention the socioeconomic impact of the closures it recommends. Continuation of current beach closures to pedestrians and ORVs will further devastate the fragile economy of Hatteras Island in an already challenging economic environment, not to mention violate the Americans with Disabilities Act, precluding that group's ready beach access.

I urge rule makers on this issue to consider carefully the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access position Statement, a document signed by several groups involved in the negotiated rule-making process, successfully provides alternatives for quality visitor experiences, simultaneously protecting fragile natural resources. Please consider all aspects of these alternatives. Allow directly-involved stakeholders?not only property and business owners and visitors?both new and long-time?a stronger voice back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore, as opposed to those who've never experienced the numerous pleasures of the Hatteras experience. Thank you for your consideration. By the way, I have no financial interest in any island property, only a 37 year long love of quiet beach walks.

Sincerely,

Diana Dreyer 116 Bradman Estates Slippery Rock, PA 16057 dyd@zoominternet.net

Correspondence ID: 13525 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, N/A

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.

I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.

Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Sam Midgett 57813 NC HWY 12 Hatteras, NC

Correspondence ID: 13526 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, N/A

Received: May,11,2010 09:14:23

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please work hard to keep the motorized orv's to a minimum on this lovely beach. There are too many places already that are dominated by the noise, fumes, danger, and destructiveness to the environment of motorized vehicles. My family and I just want to have a quiet place to escape the "accoutrements of civilization" once in awhile and it would be a great irritation, even a tragedy to be confronted with these off-road vehicles that do so much damage to the environment and the quality of life for others.

Correspondence ID:	13527	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 09:14:38						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I feel not allowing dogs on the beach is a punishment to all responsible dog owners . And we are responsible . Couldn't you fine those who do not clean up after their dogs . If you pass this ordinance into law I guess my family and I will just vacation somewhere else that is pet friendly all year long. Thanks for reading . Take care .						
Correspondence ID:	13528	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have, however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Colin Morrison 40 NW Greenwood Ave. Bend, OR 97702						
Correspondence ID:	13529	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 09:16:43						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I have been coming to the Outer Banks and Hatteras Island for over thirty years and have enjoyed the beautiful beaches, scenery and wild life. Now due to a few birds, that barely travel this far south to nest, natural predators are being killed, beach travel is closed to vehicles and fishermen. I think this is a shame. The economy has taken a hit, places are closing and quality of merchandise and service is down. Please keep the beaches open. Travel around turtle nests, just fine--we do not mind that.						
Correspondence ID:	13530	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 09:19:01						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I do not agree with limiting the use of beaches to ORV. My entire life my family has been able to drive and walk on the beaches without harming a single animal, so why does access need to be denied? Also by doing this, tourism to the Outer Banks will suffer and my states economy will suffer. Are you willing to pay these business owners for lost wages? This is totally wrong so please do not pass this!						
Correspondence ID:	13531	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	Smith, Craig						
Received:	May,11,2010 09:20:58						
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. Craig Smith						
Correspondence ID:	13532	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. National parks are about preserving natural landscapes and plant and animal life. Many people come there to be awed by nature and to be refreshed. Allowing off road vehicle use that destroys the bird/turtle life the way ORVs have done at Cape Hatteras is not responsible park management nor acceptable to me. I come to parks for the nature, not the noise of ORVs. I am overdosed by vehicle noise and emissions in urban environments and need the quietude of nature for personal restoration. To replace turtles, birds and bird sound with vehicle tracks and sounds saddens me and does nothing to refresh my spirit. It traumatizes me to think of this unnecessary level of destruction of birds and sea life in the name of "recreation." There is enough of this destruction planet wide and parks are not the place to condone it. _____						

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13533 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 09:21:56

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.

National Park Lands have been set aside for ALL not just those who want to ride and destroy - Please preserve public land for all of us and the natural resources they support!!

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13534 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 09:21:56

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: 13535 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 09:22:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13536 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 09:22:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13537 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: MIDGETT, ANGEL

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a life long resident of Hatteras Island, please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.

I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.

Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

PLEASE KEEP OUR BEACHES OPEN!

ANGEL MIDGETT RODANTHE, NC

Correspondence ID: 13538 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Goodwin, Elaine

Received: May,11,2010 09:23:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Superintendent Murray,

I am writing in opposition to alternative F, chosen by the NPS as the preferred plan for access at Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

The plan is too restrictive for ALL access, not just off-road vehicles, but for pedestrians and boaters as well. Please review the Coalition for Beach Access position. I believe it is a much more "middle of the road" option for access for all and preservation of the National Seashore.

Thanks for all that you, your staff, and NPS do for our Parks; as a regular visitor and Passport holder, I truly appreciate all that you do.

Sincerely,

Elaine Goodwin

Correspondence ID: 13539 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 09:23:46

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please ban all vehicles from the beach and sand dune areas. These areas were designated for their natural beauty and were not meant to be highways for lazy fisherman. Preserve the wildlife and ban all vehicles.

Correspondence ID: 13540 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Schawang, S E
Received: May,11,2010 09:24:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to Alternative F. I support the proposal of the Coalition to Preserve Beach Access. I know there are MANY factors to be considered, and while it has been advised to stay away from emotions in these letters, that's what the ocean is - emotional. When I think about very ill and disabled friends, who find peace and emotional (and sometimes physical) health at the beach, emotions come into play. I suppose that from some points of view - enough of the beach is being left open. I moved to KDH over seven years ago, after having stayed in Rodanthe in the late 80's. When I first moved here, and saw all the people at Oregon Inlet - and had my neighbors and co-workers talk to me about spending the day fishing at Oregon Inlet with the family, I thought about how wonderful that was. Family time - fishing time - fun time. Now I drive across the bridge and feel sadness for those who can no longer experience that family, fun, fishing time. And for what purpose? I just don't understand what is being protected. This is my second letter - my first was very short - I've been thinking about things a lot the last few weeks. When the Cape Hatteras National Seashore was created - I believe it was created for the enjoyment of the people. I don't feel that Alternative F allows for much enjoyment. Thank you for your consideration. PLEASE do not restrict beach access. I don't deal with the people that are driving (or walking - I REALLY think you should NOT address beach walking in this plan) on the beach on a daily basis like you do. If I did, I might be more understanding of the reason for the alternatives, because I do recognize that a few bad apples can spoil the whole bunch. I'm sure there are people who visit OUR beaches and do not respect the environment they are in. But having been party to organized, individual and just because beach clean-ups, I think implementing a plan such as alternative F punishes the many who care because of the few who are irresponsible jerks.

Correspondence ID: 13541 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:24:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation. Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-I portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science. For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13542 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Evans, Barbara B
Received: May,11,2010 09:25:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been visiting the Outer Banks since the early 1960's. We have vacationed either at Ocrakoke Island or Avon for over 25 years. We are working towards buying a home at Avon that we could rent out for part of the year and live in for the remainder of the year. Implementation of plan Alternative F could change those plans. Why invest in something you can't use? I want to see to the Outer Banks and the wildlife protected, but reasonably. The islanders have a done great job of balancing commerce, tourism and preservation. They live there and they love the islands and it shows. Their voices should be heard and their experience taken seriously. They are the true advocates for what is best for the islands. As a native North Carolinian and as a supporter of the Outer Banks I urge you not to implement Alternative F.

Correspondence ID: 13543 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Nadolski, Debbie E
Received: May,11,2010 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.

0012543

Correspondence ID: 13544 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:27:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft for this project, I'm in favor of the "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, but only if it's modified so that the protection of wildlife and their habitat is included.
When Cape Hatteras was first established, Congress wished that the area be preserved as a "primitive wilderness."
Just last year, on a visit to a wildlife reservation in NJ, I was deeply disappointed to have the trip interrupted by ORV's that previously were not allowed in the area.
Please don't allow this to happen to the Cape as well.
Thanks.

Correspondence ID: 13545 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Davis, Tom
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Written/signed Hyde County Coalition Statement has been mailed today.

Correspondence ID: 13546 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:28:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Mr Murry,
Thank you for the ability for me to provide public comment on the future ORV management plan. My husband, newborn son and I are 7 year-round resident of Rodanthe. My husband and I are both surfers and often use Ramp 23 to access our favorite waves. One of the changes I found in the plan that didn't seem to make sense was the development of the Ramp 23 parking facilities and walk-over access to the shoreline. The distance from the highway to the water's edge is far too great for most people to walk on hot summer days yet alone tote their family and all their belongings. We feel that a development like this could make more sense and as well be more economical to make a better impact if it were located at a new or existing ramp that was closer to the water. A good example of a distance that works would be the allover day use area to the water's edge. If you are to develop a facility such as the one outlined in the plan, we feel the cost would be justified if you position it further south of Ramp 23, where the parking lot would be more close to the water and more people would use the facility.
Our second comment has to do park users having a positive visitors' experience. After Ramp 23 closed last year, prior to Memorial Day, my husband and I often noticed both visitors and residents become very frustrated as they were unable to access the ocean. Their first try would be North of Rodanthe and the police would write parking tickets. Their second try would be on the streets surrounding Mirlo beach and then the residents would call the police and tow trucks. Their last try would be the public access points in Salvo and there we witnessed many conflicts between property owners and visitors simply trying to access the beach. The tri-village area was not designed nor developed to accommodate public parking/access to the beach, Ramp 23 has always been our go-to spot to access the ocean. I would like to thank you again for the ability to provide public comments. If you have any questions you can follow up with my email address: karmasita@hotmail.com Thank you. Chantal and Steve Simmons PO Box 302 Rodanthe, NC

Correspondence ID: 13547 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:29:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I oppose permitting off-road vehicals on the Cape Hatteras beaches. They are noisy and intrusive, disturbing wild life and visitors to the beach. Special areas may be set aside for these vehicles if their use appears important. PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THEM TO DISTURB THE PEACE AND BEAUTY OF A NATURAL AREA!

Correspondence ID: 13548 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:31:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please DO NOT allow beach driving at Hattaras, or any other beach any more than is already allowed.
Our beaches, wildlife, and our planet are already threatened and taxed by man's influence. We inherit the earth from our children, but we must take care of it now. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13549 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:31:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would like to comment on the closing of the beaches on Cape Hatteras seashore. Please take into consideration that the residents of these barrier island depend on the tourist industry to make a living. Closing the beaches to tourist and fisherman will cripple the residents of these areas. I understand that we need to be respect and take care of the birds and wildlife that God has given us, but not at the cost of a man feeding his family. I feel that we have gone to far in the direction of animals being superior over man and that is not how God designed the world to be. God gave man the priviege of naming each and ever creature on earth and put them here for us to enjoy not destroy. The reserch that has been done is not always accurate. The tide and storms have as much to do with destroying nests as man but that is not being addressed. There can be a balance for the people to protect the birds and wildlife that would not include closing all beaches. Please do not close the beaches to humans!

Correspondence ID: 13550 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, Cheryl
Received: May,11,2010 09:31:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I DISAGREE WITH THE ORV/DEIS ALTERNATIVE F,P.58, BECAUSE IT DISCRIMINATES AGAINST THE HANDICAPPED WHO OVERCOME THEIR DISABILITY THROUGH ORV USE TO REACH THE OCEAN EDGE AND SOCIALIZE NORMALLY WITH THEIR PEERS AND FAMILY. ON P 58 OF THE DEIS, THE NPS ALLOWS FOR SPECIAL USE PERMITS TO ALLOW TRANSPORTATION OF DISABLED VISITORS TO VILLAGE BEACHES BUT REQUIRE THE ORV TO BE RETURNED TO THE STREET.WHAT IF LIFESAVING EQUIPMENT IS IN THE ORV? AND WHAT ABOUT THE FAMILY/PEERS OF THE DISABLED WHO NEED TO CARE FOR AND STREET PARK THE ORV? I AM A LICENSED PHYSICAL THERAPIST AND FOR OVER 30 YEARS I HAVE RECOMMENDED CAPE HATTERAS RECREATIONAL SEASHORE TO DISABLED PATIENTS FOR THE FREEDOM BEACH ORV USE PROVIDES. THEIR FEEDBACK- THE INDEPENDENCE OF "GOING TO THE BEACH" WITH THEIR FAMILIES, NOT SITTING ON A WOODEN PLATFORM HUNDREDS OF

FET FROM THE OCEAN EDGE. ORV USE AFFORDS ACCESS THAT CARDIAC, RESPIRATORY, NEUROLOGICAL, AND MUSCULOSKELETAL PATIENTS ARE DENIED AS PEDESTRIANS. DROPPING THE DISABLED OFF, AS P 58 IMPLIES, CREATES UNNECESSARY HARDSHIPS AND RISKS IN THE EVENT OF EMERGENCIES AND REINFORCES THE STIGMA OF HANDICAPPED/DEPENDENT RATHER THAN INCLUSION/INDEPENDENT. ALTERNATIVE F DOES NOT ADEQUATELY ADDRESS THE IMPACT THE ORV CLOSURES HAVE ON THE HANDICAPPED THOUGH BIRDS AND TURTLES ARE OVERLY CONSIDERED. ALTERNATIVE F SHOULD BE SCRAPPED AND A MORE HUMAN FRIENDLY ORV PLAN BE PRESENTED.

Correspondence ID: 13551 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May, 11, 2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To the National Park Service RE: DEIS Cape Hatteras National Seashore

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas. Also, Park Service vehicles are driving through restricted areas all of the time. Wouldn't it be more protective of the nesting birds for the park employees to walk/hike into protected areas as opposed to driving into the area? 2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience. 3) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Water birds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

We are Cape Hatteras Recreation Area, designed to promote commerce and recreation for habitants and visitors as well. The recreation and commerce of habitants and visitors is being hampered and prohibited.

4) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep is slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park. One of these islands is actually named "BIRD ISLAND" because of all of the birds found there. The sound also is full of fish and other water life so that these birds have quick and easy access to a bounty of food sources and very little human contact except from boaters who only stay for a few hours of recreation and then leave.

5) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement. I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that have not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended. Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial. Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts. This all timed with a time of national economic hardship serves as a "double whammy" to businesses and residents of the Seashore Villages.

6) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "?prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

This restriction will cause a hardship to many; vacationing with pets has become more and more popular, many people travel with pets and not allowing them in a campground or parking lots causes hardships to people who want to enjoy something that they and we all pay taxes to maintain. Imagine driving for 4 or 5 or 10 hours with your family pet only to find out that you cannot let your dog out to walk when you arrive in Cape Hatteras or else receive a fine. Will there be sufficient signage to let people know that they cannot let their pet out of the car? How much will this signage cost and what is the cost of maintain and placing the signage?

We in the Seashore Villages are separate from the Northern Beaches; we have a separate lifestyle and economy. We are not shopping or entertainment oriented, we are nature and family oriented as related to fishing, boating, watersports, and beach going. We must be considered separately and we need to keep our beaches open for economic survival. We pay a large amount of taxes into the State and Federal governments and we deserve access to our beloved beach.

Thank you,
Monica Jones P.O. Box 1316 Buxton, NC 27920

Correspondence ID: 13552 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Mario, Crystal A
Received: May, 11, 2010 09:32:33

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: 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 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.

Correspondence ID: 13553 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Leonard, Anita R
Received: May,11,2010 09:32:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not agree with any of the plans currently suggested and under review. I believe the economic impact to the islands by restricting access to the beaches is being GREATLY UNDERESTIMATED. The plans are too restrictive to the fishermen and tourists that are the economic base of Hatteras Island and Ocracoke. While I support protecting our wildlife, I do not believe that 11 pairs of threatened (not endangered!) piping plovers are more important than the thousands of human lives Hatteras Island supports, and I do not support the killing of racoons and other wildlife to protect the birds. My understanding is that the number of piping plovers has more to do with the number of hurricanes in the Atlantic than the number of vehicles or pedestrians on the beaches. For the past 50 years there have been an average of 11 pairs of plovers, except during times of more than normal hurricanes, so why is the NPS trying to deny beach access now when there are the same number of plovers there have been for the past 50 years? Why do the plans close so many different areas of the beach?? I support free and open beaches. Please just rope off small areas (25 yards?) of beach if birds or turtles are nesting to protect the wildlife, but don't keep out the people all season who support and love this area. We enjoy our time on Hatteras Island, because we can drive on the beach and it is a unique experience. PLEASE do not restrict vehicle and pedestrian access to the beaches!!

Correspondence ID: 13554 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:32:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I urge the NPS to protect wildlife, and the islands themselves, by limiting (or eliminating) ORV use on the beach. My experience has been that, with vehicles on the beach, I don't feel safe either. Please leave the beach as it was for millenia - without ORVs. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13555 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 09:32:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern:
I am highly disappointed by the lack of balance in the National Park Service's preferred alternative in the draft Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement I (DEIS). The highly restrictive measures outlined in Alternative F go directly against NPS's dual mandate to provide recreational opportunities and protect resources.
I fully support the position statement written by the Coalition for Beach Access (available at <http://www.obpa-nc.org/position/statement.pdf>). The coalition's statement is a balanced, realistic approach to management that takes into account the available relevant science while recommending common sense solutions that fit nicely within the legal, political, and economic contexts of the situation.
Of the many objectionable aspects of the DEIS, I find two management recommendations particularly outrageous: the prohibition on driving the beach at night and the 1000 meter buffer for piping plover chicks.
Night Driving Prohibition The beach is a magical place to be at night, and nighttime fishing is often magically productive. The scenic value can hardly be overstated, whether you're fishing for drum under a harvest moon or watching meteors streak and bioluminescent waves sparkle under a new moon. The DEIS does not account for the incredibly high value of this recreational opportunity. For a well-considered discussion of why night driving should be allowed, please see pages 37-42 of the recently released document "Sea Turtle Management ? A Common Sense Approach for the Cape Hatteras Seashore Recreational Area" by Larry Hardham and Bob Davis (available at <http://www.obpa-nc.org/turtles/TurtleMgmtProgram.pdf>).
Plover Buffer The 1000 meter recommendation is off by an order of magnitude. Closing a 2 kilometer (1 1/4 mile) section of beach for each brood is absurd. The "Patuxent Protocols," the dubious document from which the 1000 meter buffer seems to derive, makes clear that its recommendations allow for discretion: "These protocols DO NOT ATTEMPT TO BALANCE the need for protection of these species with other activities that occur at CAHA, nor was NPS management policy considered in detail" [emphasis added] (p. 3, 2005 document). NPS's job is to balance resource protection with human activities; why, then, is NPS opting for the highest level of protection found anywhere in the scientific literature?
Thanks very much for taking the time to consider my comments.
Sincerely,
Mike Donaldson

Correspondence ID: 13556 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Pilutti, Judith L
Received: May,11,2010 09:33:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
I am very concerned that Off Road Vehicle use is being considered on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I believe that this area under the Organic Act and National Seashore legislation is to be protected for all visitors and for the wildlife and habitat. Conserving this beautiful area for now and for the future should take precedence over one form of recreation (that of ORVs) use.
As a specifically designated Park area by the US Congress, Cape Hatteras beaches should be protected by the National Park Service and permanently preserved as a primitive wilderness.
I believe that ORV use would endanger that primitive wilderness and is best suited for less fragile environments.
Thank you for the work you do, and I count on you to have the wisdom to protect one of America's most beautiful and important seashores!
Sincerely,
Judith L. Pilutti

Correspondence ID: 13557 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:34:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I visit the Cape Hatteras National Seashore (OBX), along with family and friends, several times a year during various seasons of the year for the purpose of surf fishing via the Off Road Vehicle access (ORV) to the beaches.
My visits help to support the local economy through the purchases of goods and services. If ORV beach access were to be denied I, and others like me, would cease to visit the OBX and the OBX families and businesses would economically suffer.
The vast majority of those of us that use the ORV access to the beaches do so with great respect and care. We follow the rules and regulations. The beaches are actually better off as a result of our visits than they would be otherwise (we clean, protect and preserve). Sure, there are those that don't follow the rules and regulations, as you will find any where in our society. But generally you do not punish all (via access denial) for the wrong doing of so few. Increase the enforcement and punishment of those that should be punished. If funds are an issue, I am sure that appropriate permits, fees etc. associated with the access and use of the beaches would be gladly accepted in order to rid the beaches of those that would do harm and allow continued ORV access for those that admire, respect and care for them.

It is my understanding that the OBX was established for the recreational use and enjoyment for the people. Fishing and ORV access is the largest recreational use of the beaches. Does not the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) require that the important parts and the diverse use of the OBX be preserved? Historically fishing via ORV access has been a regular and important part of the use of the beaches.

Surely intelligent and wise men and women can come up with a plan that would preserve and protect our precious seashore, while avoiding prohibiting the ORV access and its impact (huge blow to the local economy and the stripping of rights held by the people today and tomorrow to enjoy the recreation of the OBX).

Thank You,

Robert L. Handlon 3303 Wynnewood Dr. Greensboro, N.C. 27408 336/288-0033

Correspondence ID: 13558 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area DEIS Comment

The legislation states: "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area." The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species. Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings. Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lighting, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreational Area. ATVs are not permitted. These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours.

The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas. South Beach is an unproductive Plover nesting area so access should be open year round to South Beach. I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles based on peer reviewed science. Who better to advocate preservation of area wildlife than the people whose lives and futures are intertwined to the success of each species?

I agree with these Shorebird / Water bird Buffers: Species Breeding Behavior/ Nest Buffer ORV Pass-through Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 m 30 m 200 m American Oystercatcher Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Least Terns 30 m 30 m 30 m Other Species CWB 30 m 30 m 30 m MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged.

Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

*** As part of the NEPA process, I Formally Request the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions.

MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters).

MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged.

I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreation Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator.

The science offered to support the environmentalist positions does not justify the extreme ORV and pedestrian access restrictions proposed in the DEIS. I believe ORV access to Cape Point, South Beach and Hatteras Inlet should not be restricted.

The proposed 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for a piping plover unfledged chick brood is extreme and scientifically unjustified. This equals approximately 771 acres per brood. The plover closure should be reduced to 200 meters.

The Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species and the proposed 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure is extremely excessive. The Oystercatcher closure should be reduced to 15 meters.

In my opinion, there is no scientific justification to deny human entry into large areas of the recreation area and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach.

I urge you to preserve our beaches, protect natural resources with common sense policies, but not prohibit ORV use and pedestrian access to any portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area at any time. Remember, the National Seashore Recreation Area was established for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of this country. How can future generations enjoy the area if access is severely restricted? CORRIDORS are vital in providing access while managing resources. MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on peer-reviewed science. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS

0012547

should NOT have the same protection as if endangered. TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation and other practices. So, please save the communities of Hatteras Island and preserve the historic & cultural way of life of the people on this island for future generations to experience. There are many miles of unpopulated barrier islands on the east coast that are better suited to enhance shorebirds and turtles than Hatteras Island.

The enabling legislation created "The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area" for all to enjoy (beachcombers, sunbathers, surfers, horseback riders, anglers, hikers, joggers, wildlife observers, kayakers, swimmers, families, children, grandparents?). The park was never intended to be "The Cape Hatteras Special Interest Group Area for National Audubon Members Only!"

Thank You

Correspondence ID: 13559 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 09:35:25

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: At age 41 I have been a lifetime visitor and huge fan of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I am a sport fisherman and love to fish in the park. I do not have a boat and love to surf fish.

After skimming parts of the instant document, I can see that option are still limited for those of us wishing to recreate on the beaches of Cape Hatteras. I am in favor of a plan that protects all the animals in the park and allows for normal and customary ORV access. Normal and customary access as I have been privy to includes but is not limited to:

- no night time restrictions - normal enclosures around turtle nests - normal beach closures for narrow dunes / tide line - no expansion of enclosure due to violations which then preclude beach access

What I am unhappy with: - Huge wintering habitat closures - Huge spring/summer habitat closures - nighttime restrictions - enlarging of enclosures due to violations - the taking of predatory animals to increase the successful breeding efforts of the plover. These measures in my opinion, are unbalancing nature. - The use of enclosure that reach thousands of yards long are unnecessary and abusive to the publics access to the beaches. - I am tired of the very birds mentioned as being protected, also being seen nesting the parking lots of the local stores / grocery stores. This is a joke! If protection is not being afforded the birds in the towns it is not fair or practical to be biased toward the public on the beaches for pedestrian or ORV access. - enclosures! resource enclosures should only be erected in the presence of a truly endangered species. Migratory birds are not endangered!!!!

I could go on and on and write a novel for you to review, but in a nutshell, I am for continued open access for ORV and Pedistrian use of the beaches in Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I am not opposed to a permit requirement to access the beaches. But, permits should be readily available from all park rangers and all ranger stations. I also think the fee for a permit should be under \$50 per year and should not be used as a mechanism to earn income. The permit should be a mechanism for those who truly want to be on the beach and will care for it. This should deter the once a year weekend warrior just wanting to see if his/her 4x4/suv really does work.

Also, it is critical that access to the most popular spots such as the inlets (bodie island/oregon inlet, the point at buxton, hatteras inlet, and the north and south ends of ocracoke) remain available. I for one can tell you that my trips to Hatteras have been limited or cancelled due to the lack of access to the beaches I have always fished with no restrictions on access to in the past. ORV's nor Pedistrians are scaring these birds nor are they hurting or killing the birds or turtles for that matter. The environmentalists are running wild and they Fed. Govt. needs to shut them down and tell them to go away period!!

The concent decree is a joke. Judge Boyle is wrong and this needs to be remanded to a higher court. Additionally, the United States of America needs to enact its Sovereign Right and tell the environmental lawyers and groups that they will not be able to sue the federal gov't any longer.

Keep things in their simplest terms... use a permit, maintain reasonable enclosures on an as needed basis, and be reasonable on all fronts. I for one will protest to gov't if the beaches are severely limited.

Finally on the endangered species ... I would like to mention that I have read on fed gov't websites that the number of sea turtles is unknown and they have no idea where they go once out in the ocean! If their numbers are unknown then how can we positively state that they are endangered????? Science is key, and estimating species population through algorithms and estimating is not a fact based system and not reliable, plus it can be manipulated by whoever is writing the formulas. In addition, the science behind the breeding success of the Piping Plover is flawed. There have been no successes in additional breeding of the plover at cape hatteras with the restrictions of beach access to ORV's, over prior years. Science must concede that fledgling rates will vary from year to year and with respect of weather, tides, and natural predation.

Thank you, Andrew Fonda

Correspondence ID: 13560 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 09:35:45

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: At age 41 I have been a lifetime visitor and huge fan of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I am a sport fisherman and love to fish in the park. I do not have a boat and love to surf fish.

After skimming parts of the instant document, I can see that option are still limited for those of us wishing to recreate on the beaches of Cape Hatteras. I am in favor of a plan that protects all the animals in the park and allows for normal and customary ORV access. Normal and customary access as I have been privy to includes but is not limited to:

- no night time restrictions - normal enclosures around turtle nests - normal beach closures for narrow dunes / tide line - no expansion of enclosure due to violations which then preclude beach access

What I am unhappy with: - Huge wintering habitat closures - Huge spring/summer habitat closures - nighttime restrictions - enlarging of enclosures due to violations - the taking of predatory animals to increase the successful breeding efforts of the plover. These measures in my opinion, are unbalancing nature. - The use of enclosure that reach thousands of yards long are unnecessary and abusive to the publics access to the beaches. - I am tired of the very birds mentioned as being protected, also being seen nesting the parking lots of the local stores / grocery stores. This is a joke! If protection is not being afforded the birds in the towns it is not fair or practical to be biased toward the public on the beaches for pedestrian or ORV access. - enclosures! resource enclosures should only be erected in the presence of a truly endangered species. Migratory birds are not endangered!!!!

I could go on and on and write a novel for you to review, but in a nutshell, I am for continued open access for ORV and Pedistrian use of the beaches in Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I am not opposed to a permit requirement to access the beaches. But, permits should be readily available from all park rangers and all ranger stations. I also think the fee for a permit should be under \$50 per year and should not be used as a mechanism to earn income. The permit should be a mechanism for those who truly want to be on the beach and will care for it. This should deter the once a year weekend warrior just wanting to see if his/her 4x4/suv really does work.

Also, it is critical that access to the most popular spots such as the inlets (bodie island/oregon inlet, the point at buxton, hatteras inlet, and the north and south ends of ocracoke) remain available. I for one can tell you that my trips to Hatteras have been limited or cancelled due to the lack of access to the beaches I have always fished with no restrictions on access to in the past. ORV's nor Pedistrians are scaring these birds nor are they hurting or killing the birds or turtles for that matter. The environmentalists are running wild and they Fed. Govt. needs to shut them down and tell them to go away period!!

The concent decree is a joke. Judge Boyle is wrong and this needs to be remanded to a higher court. Additionally, the United States of America needs to enact its Sovereign Right and tell the environmental lawyers and groups that they will not be able to sue the federal gov't any longer.

Keep things in their simplest terms... use a permit, maintain reasonable enclosures on an as needed basis, and be reasonable on all fronts. I for one will protest to gov't if the beaches are severely limited.

Finally on the endangered species ... I would like to mention that I have read on fed gov't websites that the number of sea turtles is unknown and they

0012548

have no idea where they go once out in the ocean! If their numbers are unknown then how can we positively state that they are endangered???? Science is key, and estimating species population through algorithms and estimating is not a fact based system and not reliable, plus it can be manipulated by whoever is writing the formulas. In addition, the science behind the breeding success of the Piping Plover is flawed. There have been no successes in additional breeding of the plover at cape hatteras with the restrictions of beach access to ORV's, over prior years. Science must concede that fledgling rates will vary from year to year and with respect of weather, tides, and natural predation.
Thank you, Andrew Fonda

Correspondence ID: 13561 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:35:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: At age 41 I have been a lifetime visitor and huge fan of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I am a sport fisherman and love to fish in the park. I do not have a boat and love to surf fish.
After skimming parts of the instant document, I can see that option are still limited for those of us wishing to recreate on the beaches of Cape Hatteras. I am in favor of a plan that protects all the animals in the park and allows for normal and customary ORV access. Normal and customary access as I have been privy to includes but is not limited to:
- no night time restrictions - normal enclosures around turtle nests - normal beach closures for narrow dunes / tide line - no expansion of enclosure due to violations which then preclude beach access
What I am unhappy with: - Huge wintering habitat closures - Huge spring/summer habitat closures - nighttime restrictions - enlarging of enclosures due to violations - the taking of predatory animals to increase the successful breeding efforts of the plover. These measures in my opinion, are unbalancing nature. - The use of enclosure that reach thousands of yards long are unnecessary and abusive to the publics access to the beaches. - I am tired of the very birds mentioned as being protected, also being seen nesting the parking lots of the local stores / grocery stores. This is a joke! If protection is not being afforded the birds in the towns it is not fair or practical to be biased toward the public on the beaches for pedestrian or ORV access. - enclosures! resource enclosures should only be erected in the presence of a truly endangered species. Migratory birds are not endangered!!!!
I could go on and on and write a novel for you to review, but in a nutshell, I am for continued open access for ORV and Pedistrian use of the beaches in Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
I am not opposed to a permit requirement to access the beaches. But, permits should be readily available from all park rangers and all ranger stations. I also think the fee for a permit should be under \$50 per year and should not be used as a mechanism to earn income. The permit should be a mechanism for those who truly want to be on the beach and will care for it. This should deter the once a year weekend warrior just wanting to see if his/her 4x4/suv really does work.
Also, it is critical that access to the most popular spots such as the inlets (bodie island/oregon inlet, the point at buxton, hatteras inlet, and the north and south ends of ocracoke) remain available. I for one can tell you that my trips to Hatteras have been limited or cancelled due to the lack of access to the beaches I have always fished with no restrictions on access to in the past. ORV's nor Pedistrians are scaring these birds nor are they hurting or killing the birds or turtles for that matter. The environmentalists are running wild and they Fed. Govt. needs to shut them down and tell them to go away period!!
The concent decree is a joke. Judge Boyle is wrong and this needs to be remanded to a higher court. Additionally, the United States of America needs to enact its Sovereign Right and tell the environmental lawyers and groups that they will not be able to sue the federal gov't any longer.
Keep things in their simplest terms... use a permit, maintain reasonable enclosures on an as needed basis, and be reasonable on all fronts. I for one will protest to gov't if the beaches are severely limited.
Finally on the endangered species ... I would like to mention that I have read on fed gov't websites that the number of sea turtles is unknown and they have no idea where they go once out in the ocean! If their numbers are unknown then how can we positively state that they are endangered???? Science is key, and estimating species population through algorithms and estimating is not a fact based system and not reliable, plus it can be manipulated by whoever is writing the formulas. In addition, the science behind the breeding success of the Piping Plover is flawed. There have been no successes in additional breeding of the plover at cape hatteras with the restrictions of beach access to ORV's, over prior years. Science must concede that fledgling rates will vary from year to year and with respect of weather, tides, and natural predation.
Thank you, Andrew Fonda

Correspondence ID: 13562 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:36:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: At age 41 I have been a lifetime visitor and huge fan of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I am a sport fisherman and love to fish in the park. I do not have a boat and love to surf fish.
After skimming parts of the instant document, I can see that option are still limited for those of us wishing to recreate on the beaches of Cape Hatteras. I am in favor of a plan that protects all the animals in the park and allows for normal and customary ORV access. Normal and customary access as I have been privy to includes but is not limited to:
- no night time restrictions - normal enclosures around turtle nests - normal beach closures for narrow dunes / tide line - no expansion of enclosure due to violations which then preclude beach access
What I am unhappy with: - Huge wintering habitat closures - Huge spring/summer habitat closures - nighttime restrictions - enlarging of enclosures due to violations - the taking of predatory animals to increase the successful breeding efforts of the plover. These measures in my opinion, are unbalancing nature. - The use of enclosure that reach thousands of yards long are unnecessary and abusive to the publics access to the beaches. - I am tired of the very birds mentioned as being protected, also being seen nesting the parking lots of the local stores / grocery stores. This is a joke! If protection is not being afforded the birds in the towns it is not fair or practical to be biased toward the public on the beaches for pedestrian or ORV access. - enclosures! resource enclosures should only be erected in the presence of a truly endangered species. Migratory birds are not endangered!!!!
I could go on and on and write a novel for you to review, but in a nutshell, I am for continued open access for ORV and Pedistrian use of the beaches in Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
I am not opposed to a permit requirement to access the beaches. But, permits should be readily available from all park rangers and all ranger stations. I also think the fee for a permit should be under \$50 per year and should not be used as a mechanism to earn income. The permit should be a mechanism for those who truly want to be on the beach and will care for it. This should deter the once a year weekend warrior just wanting to see if his/her 4x4/suv really does work.
Also, it is critical that access to the most popular spots such as the inlets (bodie island/oregon inlet, the point at buxton, hatteras inlet, and the north and south ends of ocracoke) remain available. I for one can tell you that my trips to Hatteras have been limited or cancelled due to the lack of access to the beaches I have always fished with no restrictions on access to in the past. ORV's nor Pedistrians are scaring these birds nor are they hurting or killing the birds or turtles for that matter. The environmentalists are running wild and they Fed. Govt. needs to shut them down and tell them to go away period!!
The concent decree is a joke. Judge Boyle is wrong and this needs to be remanded to a higher court. Additionally, the United States of America needs to enact its Sovereign Right and tell the environmental lawyers and groups that they will not be able to sue the federal gov't any longer.
Keep things in their simplest terms... use a permit, maintain reasonable enclosures on an as needed basis, and be reasonable on all fronts. I for one will protest to gov't if the beaches are severely limited.
Finally on the endangered species ... I would like to mention that I have read on fed gov't websites that the number of sea turtles is unknown and they have no idea where they go once out in the ocean! If their numbers are unknown then how can we positively state that they are endangered???? Science is key, and estimating species population through algorithms and estimating is not a fact based system and not reliable, plus it can be manipulated by

whoever is writing the formulas. In addition, the science behind the breeding success of the Piping Plover is flawed. There have been no successes in additional breeding of the plover at cape hatteras with the restrictions of beach access to ORV's, over prior years. Science must concede that fledgling rates will vary from year to year and with respect of weather, tides, and natural predation.
Thank you, Andrew Fonda

Correspondence ID: 13563 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:36:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I AM OPPOSED TO ALTERNATIVE F & SUPPORT THE COALITION FOR BEACH ACESS POSITION, WITH RESPECT TO CAPE HATTERAS NAT SEASHORE REC AREA OFF ROAD VEHICLE PLAN/ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STMT DRAFT. I DO NOT UNDERSTAND THE JUSTIFICATION FOR THE RESTRICTIVENESS OF THIS PROPOSAL. SISNCERELY TERRI CALLAHAN

Correspondence ID: 13564 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 09:40:35
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: 13565 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:42:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Regarding Pet Restrictions:
REFERENCE - Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages. No Pets in public areas beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 through July 31.
COMMENTS: As a multi-year visitor to the Outer Banks, I can state unequivocally that I will no longer visit if I am not able to take my dogs to the beach. While I LOVE the Outer Banks, my family and I love traveling with our dogs even more and we will find other "pet friendly" vacation places to go. Why vacation with pets if they can't join you on the beach for play and recreation?
I know many, many of my friends who make their vacation decisions based on the ability to be with and recreate with their dog companions at the shore, on a lake, and on hikes. Your restrictions will drive away many dog owners who would otherwise choose your location for a spring/summer vacation.
Leashed dogs cannot do damage...please allow them year-round! (And possibly consider an off-leash designated area without access to nesting areas).

Correspondence ID: 13566 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:42:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: For the last 14 years I have owned a business on Hatteras Island. With the economic downturn most businesses are barely 'holding on' to survive. If the environmentalists are allowed to get their way it is likely many businesses will fail causing more folks in the unemployment lines burdening our already very delicate economy. More importantly it should be noted that Hatteras Island wildlife has been thriving for many years, well before the environmentalists decided to take up a cause on the island. The natives and guests on HI are here because of their respect and love of nature. There are plenty of other beaches on the east coast to vacation but if you talk to HI vacationers especially to those who are first-timers they commonly agree this is a peaceful nature-loving area and they love the solitude of the beaches. Many natives are instrumental in protecting the wildlife here and go to great lengths and give much time to monitor turtle nests, etc. I pray that the environmentalists do not turn our beautiful Hatteras Island into California where they were instrumental in putting 50,000 people out of work/business in one area. The HI locals have weathered many horrible storms, hurricanes, norasters but I'm beginning to believe we highly-intelligent humans will soon be on the extinct list promoted by a small body of environmentalists -- who then will be monitoring our nests? Please ensure sanity and common sense are applied to the Outers Banks of Hatteras Island.

Correspondence ID: 13567 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: DEIS Comments for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
The legislation states: "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area." The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species. Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their

desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings. Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lighting, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreational Area. ATVs are not permitted. These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours.

The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas. South Beach is an unproductive Plover nesting area so access should be open year round to South Beach. I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles based on peer reviewed science. Who better to advocate preservation of area wildlife than the people whose lives and futures are intertwined to the success of each species?

I agree with these Shorebird / Water bird Buffers: Species Breeding Behavior/ Nest Buffer ORV Pass-through Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 m 30 m 200 m American Oystercatcher Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Least Terns 30 m 30 m 30 m Other Species CWB 30 m 30 m 30 m MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged.

Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

*** As part of the NEPA process, I Formally Request the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions.

MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters).

MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged.

I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreational Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator.

The science offered to support the environmentalist positions does not justify the extreme ORV and pedestrian access restrictions proposed in the DEIS. I believe ORV access to Cape Point, South Beach and Hatteras Inlet should not be restricted.

The proposed 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for a piping plover unfledged chick brood is extreme and scientifically unjustified. This equals approximately 771 acres per brood. The plover closure should be reduced to 200 meters.

The Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species and the proposed 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure is extremely excessive. The Oystercatcher closure should be reduced to 15 meters.

In my opinion, there is no scientific justification to deny human entry into large areas of the recreation area and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach.

I urge you to preserve our beaches, protect natural resources with common sense policies, but not prohibit ORV use and pedestrian access to any portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area at any time. Remember, the National Seashore Recreation Area was established for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of this country. How can future generations enjoy the area if access is severely restricted? CORRIDORS are vital in providing access while managing resources. MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on peer-reviewed science. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should NOT have the same protection as if endangered. TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation and other practices.

So, please save the communities of Hatteras Island and preserve the historic & cultural way of life of the people on this island for future generations to experience. There are many miles of unpopulated barrier islands on the east coast that are better suited to enhance shorebirds and turtles than Hatteras Island.

The enabling legislation created "The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area" for all to enjoy (beachcombers, sunbathers, surfers, horseback riders, anglers, hikers, joggers, wildlife observers, kayakers, swimmers, families, children, grandparents?). The park was never intended to be "The Cape Hatteras Special Interest Group Area for National Audubon Members Only!"

Thank You

Correspondence ID: 13568 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Waldrop, Richard

Received: May, 11, 2010 09:48:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe the existing consent decree policies are overly restrictive, are damaging, and will further damage the economy of the outer banks. I am in favor of protecting endangered species but there needs to be a balance. I have seen policies regarding beach driving and beach access particularly involving the plovers, that are rendering large sections of the beach off limits. What is the point of having a National Park if we can't use it? I propose that no entire section of any beach be closed for this protection. There must be specific access ways for both vehicles and pedestrians that allow access to other areas of the beach beyond where the protected areas are located while maintaining reasonable buffer areas for nesting birds or turtles.

Correspondence ID: 13569 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Zavetsky, Bill
Received: May,11,2010 09:49:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I will only say that as a taxpaying American, I am appalled that a few groups of individuals who favor animal rights over human rights have been able to just about shutdown access to the Cape Hatteras National RECREATION Area.
 I expect access to my beach as I support the beach via my tax dollars. The Cape Hatteras national Recreation Area is not, and should not be, a bird or turtle sanctuary. There is Pea Island for that purpose.
 Do I support protecting animals from the few crazy people out there? Of course I do! But don't remove a right of access to ALL for the stupidity and carelessness of a few.
 Species go extinct daily. Do you really think we as humans can prevent the next one from going extinct?
 Think about this, if the dinosaurs did not go extinct, we wouldn't be here to help keep the birds from going extinct.
 Give all of us, 4x4'ers included, more access to our national treasure that is the Cape Hatteras National Recreation Area- Since 1954 I believe.
 thanks for listening.

Correspondence ID: 13570 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:51:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: When endangering wildlife, fauna & flora & the natural processes of the seashore, we must eliminate the hazards that are causing these situations & I believe that offroad vehicles are doing just that.

Correspondence ID: 13571 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:51:58
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: 13572 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:51:58
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: 13573 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

This alternative plan presents a rare opportunity for finding common ground where non-ORV users of the beaches and those committed to the care of creation can meet. Families can continue to enjoy non-ORV uses they have always enjoyed and also protect the beaches, including wildlife, that they want their children and grandchildren to enjoy, too.

If you cannot see fit to enact the Alternative D plan, please ensure fair use by non-ORV users. Please:

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

* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this priority. That's because protection of natural resources provides near-term and long-term legacy benefits for everyone, while allowing off-road vehicles provides temporary thrills for only a few at the expense of other people and their common natural inheritance--including the economic benefits that come from maintaining an area that will attract all kinds of visitors. Plan F also fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year-round for wildlife, including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Based on science, the wildlife disturbance buffers in the Plan F are bare minimums; at least increase them if science indicates it is necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13574 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:52:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13575 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: BITHELL, KARA
Received: May,11,2010 09:55:23
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: PLEASE FIND AN ALTERNATIVE AND PRESERVE THIS AREA

Correspondence ID: 13576 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 09:57:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a surfer and kite boarder from California, you may wonder what my investment is in access issues in N. Carolina. I travel to the Hatteras area at least once a year for a week or two stay to enjoy the wind and the waves. I hope that the State can craft a usage program that protects the environment and maintains a reasonable level of access. Fore the most part surfers and kites are among the most respectful and ecologically minded group of people out there. Please maintain access.

Correspondence ID: 13577 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Young, Kenneth
Received: May,11,2010 09:57:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the proposed restrictions on pedestrian and off road vehicle (ORV) access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. Predators have a larger impact on protected wildlife populations than do vehicles or pedestrians. ORV and other recreational uses would NOT have long term major adverse impacts on sea turtles as there have NOT been frequent deaths, nest lost, disorientation or hatchling mortality due to ORV use or night time beach driving. Dredge and spoil island populations must be included in total population counts for accurate numbers and activity.

Correspondence ID: 13578 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

0012553

Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.

I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.

Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Amanda VanDyke 52084 Piney Ridge Rd P.O. Box 427 Frisco NC 27936

Correspondence ID: 13579 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: RUCKER, ROGER L

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954

Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.

I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.

Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Roger Rucker 50029 Bay Side Court Frisco, NC 27936 mailing address Box 564 Buxton, NC 27920

Correspondence ID: 13580 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Brake, Ricky C

Received: May,11,2010 10:02:42

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please keep in mind the people who use and enjoy the beaches and those whose livelihoods depend on full access yet monitored beaches as you consider your final options. The impacts to us are huge. Please do not cave in to the fear of continued lawsuit by the three environmentalist groups who filed suit in 2008 with the cooperation of environmentalist judge Boyle. You hold the power to stand up for the citizens who need the access, and at the same time stand up to the overprotective environmentalists and say they have gone too far. Your ORV management plan should be able to stand the light of day even if it gives the same degree of openness, although monitored, as it did before the lawsuit and the consent decree. You as the park service have always done a good job, we just hit a bump in the road with the lawsuit. Now it is time to stand up to those environmentalists and say they are overstepping as they always have done and they always will continue to do as long as people let them do it. Thanks for continuing to work with the citizens as you explore an option better than F, at least try to keep corridors in place for moving around closures.

Correspondence ID: 13581 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Mosher, Kim

Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Dear Mike Murray,

I strongly disagree with the predation program.

Page #237 "Foraging Habitat." There is a ghost crab shown on this page. It's part of the gull-billed terns diet. Why are park employees killing ghost crabs in the park? Page #232 "Human Activity." DEIS states a negative impact to nesting shore birds due to ORV and pedestrians. FACT: NPS acknowledges their vehicles ran over 20 piping plovers in the nesting season. UMF research. Page #232 "Risk Factors to American Oystercatchers." DEIS states human disturbance is only 4% and ocean overwash is 29%. Why shut down Cape Point when it's an overwash area? Page #209 "Predation 1st paragraph DEIS lists all predators." The last predator listed is "birds of prey". Why are all the other predators trapped and killed in htis park, except for falcons and hawks? Predation is part of the natural balance in wildlife. Stop trapping and killing all over the island. Page #212 "Research, surveying, and protective management activities are a risk to piping plovers." The DEIS just stated that NPS, biologists, trappers...are negatively impacting the piping plovers. Need I say more!?

Sincerely,

Kim Mosher

Correspondence ID: 13582 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954

Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.

I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.

Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

WENDI SIDWELL 41191 WINDLASS CT AVON NC 27915

Correspondence ID: 13583 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very disturbed by the proposed ORVs plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore that will allow disproportionant use of ORVs on an area that was to be set aside as a "primitave wilderness" except for "some" recreational use. When this park was established I do not think this wording ment that almost all the seashore should have trucks parked on it. Just because this was allowed in the past does not mean that it needs to continue. Upon reading the proposal it appears that this proposal has been unduly affected by the very local demands of the the fishing community. This is not how a NATIONAL treasure should be administered. Please reconsider the proposal and take into account what the seashore was supposed to be.

As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and a supporter of national parks, I appreciate the chance to submit comments on the draft

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

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

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

Correspondence ID:	13584	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	cleaver, john e						
Received:	May,11,2010 10:06:44						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	vision without action is merily a dream.actionwithoutvision just passes the time vision with action can change the world " let us work together to allow this special area to continue to benifit nature,man and the environment.						
Correspondence ID:	13585	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have, however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Cassie Gray PO Box 939 Buxton, NC 27920						
Correspondence ID:	13586	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Heidi Blackwood General Manager, Dare Building Supply PO Box 501 Buxton, NC 27920						
Correspondence ID:	13587	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Mosher, Kim						
Received:	May,04,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Letter						
Correspondence:	Dear Mike Murray, I strongly disagree with the DEIS on pages 121-127 concerning the large, inflexible and non-scientific buffers of 1,000 meters for piping plovers. Piping plovers are not even endangered. This 1,000 meter buffer is no where else in this country. Why here? This 1,000 meter buffer completely takes away the observance and education to the human race. I live right here in Buxton, NC 2 miles from Cape Point. I can no longer nejoy, observe or educate myself or others on the seashores nesting birds. The biologists that work in the Park even say it's way to big. "OverKill"! Piping plovers forage on sand/mud flats, not the rough north side of Cape Point. Cape Point, historically is a flooded wash over area, that constantly changes with each tide. Storms and ocean swells historically reshape this unique area. Historical and cultural Cape Point should never be denied access, and I don't mean walking in waist water. There can be room for both human access and protected nest sites for shorebirds. I've observed this for 25 years. Clear some vegetation near the salt ponds. It used to be much more favorable for nesting birds, before ORV and pedestrian access was denied. Please show me the science that proves the 1,000 meter really works. After the 2nd year of Audubon's consent decree; it did not prove to help the piping plovers. They actually declined in numbers. Sincerely, Kim Mosher						
Correspondence ID:	13588	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Mosher, Kim						
Received:	May,04,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Letter						
Correspondence:	Dear Mike Murray, I strongly disagree with the DEIS pages #270-285 concerning the Socioeconomic Impact. Page #28` quote "The economy of the ROI is largely driven by the reigon's tourist draw, mainly during hte summer months." end quote... Hatteras Island's economy is more than just summer months. Spring and Fall fishing has always been a huge part of the economy here for well over 50 years. Beach closures have dramatically impacted this industry negatively, as well as other activities in the Park. THE ROI is a very weak example of how important Dare County's economy is to the state of North Carolina. Dare County used to be one of the top 4 donor counties to North Carolina. Now we are 4.1 million dollars under budget. North Carolin State is 410 million dollars under budget. Shutting beaches down with non-scientific 1,000 meter buffers is clearly destroying this economy. Why would tourists come to a Naitonal Recreatoinal Park, when it is closed. No one that owns a business on Hatteras Island was asked how their business has struggle with closed beaches due to the consent Decree. Including myself. Why? How can you say the ROI was factual in the DEIS?						

Correspondence ID: 13589 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Ervin, Heather
Received: May,11,2010 10:14:59
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: 13590 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:15:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I do not agree with the DEIS. The proposed legislation and restrictions are not congruent with the successful preservation measures that other parks have seen success utilizing. 1,000 meter restrictions for one nest is an extreme measure and other parks have implemented 300 meter rules and seen great success. I'm for protecting the natural environment and it's native species, but this can be accomplished without the huge economic impact that would be seen if this drafted version of restrictions were put in affect. The restrictions listed in the DEIS are overkill and should be optimized to ensure the least amount of environmental and economic impact.

Correspondence ID: 13591 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:17:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family visits the Cape Hatteras sea shore about three to four times a year. It is our favorite place to get away on vacations. My husband is a fisherman and has always went there to fish. We drive out on the beach and enjoy the experience. We are all about preserving the area and being responsible to the park and the animals living there. People and animals can co exist. Man should come before animals in the long scheme of things. Plans just need to be made to benefit both. Closing a whole beach from man so that a bird can nest is insane. If we are not smart enough by now to figure out away around a birds nest than we really haven't evolved much have we??? I want to share the sea shore with my children and someday their children but if I can't because a bird may want to nest there, what a shame. If I am not mistaken can't birds FLY? I mean really what are we talking about here? People and animals co exist all across the world. You can't close down the mountains because their may be bears or wolves there. You can't close down the cities because their may be deer in the neighborhoods. In my opinion, I feel closing down the beaches would be a huge mistake for everyone. If the birds do not like having people around than they can fly else where. Families should have the right to enjoy what God has given us and it should not be regulated by one group of conservationist. I am all for protecting animals and their rights but what about the rights of the people. Please do not close the beaches. Sincerely Beach Lover Angela Weston

Correspondence ID: 13592 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Harty, Karen
Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Sir:
Comment on DEIS (p.124) pro-active adaptive management NPS should aggressively pursue adaptive man. initiatives identified in DEIS to improve success with resource protection and visitor access. NPS res. man. ped./ORV closure policies address the least significant factor affecting nest survival. Mammal predation 54% high risk Storms/tides 29% Nest abandonment 6% Avian pred. 5% Ghost crab pred. 3% Human interference 3% insig. risk Thanks

Correspondence ID: 13593 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Finley, Margaret E
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the 1000 meter buffer for an unfledged plover nest. The science is 200 meters For proper protection for the birds.
I disagree with the DEIS for the following; NEPA requires analysis of the preservation of cultural resources, you have failed this directive having just two paragraphs in over 800 pages devoted to cultural resources.
I disagree with the economic impact study, it is understated and cannot be defended. Businesss will have to adapt to the new rules? Businesses are closing because of the new rules, and the Consent decree.
I disagree with Option F
I support The Coalition for Beach Access

Correspondence ID: 13594 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:18:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please accept this letter as my comments on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. The DEIS management alternatives have little to do with developing a responsible off road vehicle management plan. The alternatives map out a plan to exclude humans from the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area. Unless my feet are now classified as

off road vehicles, this document is wat off base.

A 1000 meter buffer zone for common shore bird nests ia absolutely absurd. This buffer zone allows a bird nest a circle that cannot be entered by humans that is over a mile across! We do not afford this type of easment to any other animal. We do not provide this much of a buffer zone to the president! It makes no sense what so ever to place the buffer zone around the nests of oyster catchers and terns let alone the misguided plovers that are attempting to nest outside of their natural range.

Another thing that really bothers me is the way the National Park Service is slaughtering mamalian wildlife under the guise of protecting endangered birds. THE BIRDS ARE NOT ENDANGERED! The fact that the park service is deciding which wildlife can live and which species should be irradiated disgusts me.

I have reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process (another travesty) 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 actual people, not lawyers, back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Nicholas Belcastro Sr.

Correspondence ID: 13595 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Johnson, Ladd
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.
Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters. Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.
Sincerely, Ladd Johnson

Correspondence ID: 13596 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Pollock, Stephen C
Received: May,11,2010 10:19:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Regarding the prohibition on pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season, page 136:
I think the prohibition of pets in popular places such as campgrounds to be unnecessary and unduly restrictive. I support the ability of visitors to bring pets to the Seashore at anytime, and anywhere that pedestrian and / or ORV access is allowed. Pets, on the typical 6 foot or less leash, do not in any way pose a threat to the environment. By banning pets outright, visitors who travel with their pets and enjoy recreational activities with those pets will be excluded from enjoying the seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13597 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:19:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As I child we visited the Outer Banks and my favorite part was driving on the beach and hanging out for the day. We now travel and rent a beach house 2-3 weeks a year. If we are no longer able to drive out on the beach we would not consider going on vaction to the Outer Banks anymore. It would be disappointing for all.

Correspondence ID: 13598 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Pardi, Scott
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The park service should formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.
Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.
Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to endangered and protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.
The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13599 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:22:07
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: 13600 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:22:14
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: 13601 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:22:14
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: 13602 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Harty, Karen
Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Sir:
The socioeconomic data and analyses in the DEIS (pg. 270-281; 561-698) result in misleading and sometimes erroneous conclusions. Critical

weaknesses pertain to: 1) Statistical definition of ROI 2) Incomplete and inadequate visitation/business survey data 3) Erroneous recreational user data 4) Inflated overall visitor counts pertaining to beach use at areas not near or in Hatteras 5) Flawed assumption concerning maintenance of access under Alt. F. These flaws are directly manifested in both effected envir. and socioecon. impact sec. of DEIS.
Thank You

Correspondence ID:	13603	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 10:23:44						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	To whom it may concern I find the DEIS to be totally inaccurate and lacking in common sense alternatives to beach access and resource protection. Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area is uniquely suited to beach driving, surf fishing and recreation since unlike the remainder of the Outer Banks it is not overly developed. What it is not suited for is bird and turtle nesting due to the frequent storms and overwash that flood the nest and the predators that eat the eggs, not to mention it is at the farthest reaches of the breeding areas for the proposed protected species. I ask and implore as a tax payer, land owner and responsible user that you disregard the special environmental terrorist groups and implement a more fair and user friendly alternative such as that proposed by the groups making up the Preserve Access organization. Do the right thing and protect access for the people of America.						
Correspondence ID:	13604	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Holloman, Larry W						
Received:	May,11,2010 10:24:55						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I am appalled at the slaughter of indigenous wildlife currently undertaken by state-sanctioned organizations. Has there been an eco study to determine the cumulative effect on wildlife by this slaughter? The request will be made eventually and the State will have a lot of explaining to do. The State should consider the negative impact of a series of press articles, and the possibility of denial of income lawsuits from the local population. I'm also opposed to the unrealistically wide buffers given to the plover and Oystercatcher, and to the 'no pets' rule. State officials need to very carefully consider negative impacts of the decisions they make. In the end, it comes down to protecting the plover or the jobs of the residents of Ocracoke and other affected areas. Do State officials really want to be forced to defend themselves in front of a tv camera and an angry citizenry? Larry Holloman						
Correspondence ID:	13605	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 10:25:27						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	My husband and I own and operate the Down Under Restaurant in Waves, NC and live in Salvo, NC. We have lived here for over 12 years and have seen many changes in the way people vacation in the area, but the closing of the beaches for a bird that builds its nest on top of Food Lion, beside Rt 12 in the 55 mph area and seemed to thrive, has hurt us and our neighbors more than anything. While I am not a biologist, it does concern me that the animals around the light house were slaughtered in order to save this bird that is not close to extinction. Where in your moral life is this ok? A ghost crab is not as worthy as a piping plover? If the plover needs 771 acres to nest its young, what do we do with Rt 12 when a nest is found again beside it? Close the island?? What bothers me as much as losing money for me and my employees is that the people who lived on this island, GAVE the property to the Park Service for the GOOD of all to visit. The descendants of the forward thinking people cannot even walk to the ocean. I urge you to reconsider your recommendation and look to the science for the plover and turtles. It is ridiculous that deep-pocket pac's can rewrite the history of this beautiful island; please listen to Dare County's recommendations and the people who live here who are not slaughtering plovers, we just want to enjoy our beaches and make a living.						
Correspondence ID:	13606	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.						
Correspondence ID:	13607	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 10:25:51						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I disagree with the DEIS and the closing of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I believe that closing access to the beaches will have more of a negative impact on the beaches as well as to the local economy. The closing of night time driving will allow more mammalian predators to run free and attack the plover nests as well as turtle nests. I think that the islands off the coast provide better habitat for the plovers and other seashore birds and should be included in the studies of birds in the area.						
Correspondence ID:	13608	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,11,2010 10:26:11						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	On Behalf of all the hardworking people of Dare county, I submit my comments. Since before the Wright Brothers discovered flight here, the Dare county area has been a haven to U.S. taxpaying citizens looking to enjoy the activities this great area offers. Fishing, hunting, hiking, swimming, beachcombing, and boating are just a few. We have coexisted with nature peacefully for hundreds of years until a few over zealous critics expressed unsubstantiated concern over a few species of birds. Now, politics and special interests have pushed this issue of beach driving and open access to the brink. We will NOT sit by and let this happen. I respectfully ask that our constitutional rights to public land not be infringed upon. There is not one single legitimate reason to ban open access to the historical areas of recreation we have enjoyed for so long. Whether by foot or vehicle, we will						

continue to enjoy OUR beaches just as our forefathers.

Correspondence ID:	13609	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 10:26:45						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please keep our NC beaches as pristine as possible. Do not allow driving on them.						
Correspondence ID:	13610	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 10:28:42						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	When concerning the matter of ORV access at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore I only ask that the national park Service uses legitimate science and not science of a speculative nature. For example, the piping plover population appears to be more adversely effected by the frequency of severe storms instead of the number of people on the beach. Thanks for your consideration. John Edward O'Donnell						
Correspondence ID:	13611	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Harty, Karen						
Received:	May,04,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Letter						
Correspondence:	Dear Sir: Regarding " DEIS (p. vi) visitor experience could be affected by conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreation users... 1) Why is there no list of reported incidents? 2) No plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs (United Mobile Sports Man Club) 3) Pedestrian violaitons are much more significant than ORV violations. Thank You!						
Correspondence ID:	13612	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 10:29:23						
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. Please don't permit the destruction seen is some of our National Parks by off road vehicles to ruin this land for everyone else. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.						
Correspondence ID:	13613	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	McDaniel, Deanna						
Received:	May,11,2010 10:29:55						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	In an already disastrous economy the actions taken by the Court and the Park Service have proved devastating to all businesses and residents on Hatteras Island. For anyone to claim differently would be either a misguided statement of ignorance or just plain falisification of the truth. Today our livelihoods are being threatened, by an apparently severly misguided yet politically connected group of people. When reviewing the mngement of any wildlife species by the state of North Carolina, anyone can see our management plans are based on reliable and reputable science and data. POLITICAL WHIMS AND INFLUENCE FROM BEHIND DOOR NEGOTIATIONS AND ARM TWISTING are not entered into the formula for the management of species by our State. I am concerned that political inclination is the reason for and basis of the management buffers within the DEIS. A 1,000 meter buffer in all directions of an unfledged piping plover chick represents 771 acres of closed beach. This is arbitrary and capricious when managing a species. A buffer of 200 meters would be just as effective for the survival of the chick, without extreme penalization of the residents and visitors of Hatteras Island. I have raised my daughter here with childhood days spent in with the park service, looking for turtle nest, cleaning the lighthouse, keeping beached whales alive on cold January days, enjoying sunrise service on Easter Sunday at the old lighthouse sight where her great grandfathers name in etched in stone for the whole world to know that he kept the light burning. No one cares more about our island or its natural inhabitants than those of us who choose a way of life in this remote location, instead of going with the popular flow of bright lights big city. Make sure you take the time to make a decision based on facts and workable plans to keep our island alive for everyone.						
Correspondence ID:	13614	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 10:30:07						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I have been a resident of both the state of Virginia and the state of North Carolina for over 35 years and have been visiting the Outer Banks and specifically the Cape Hatteras National Seashore since 1975. Part of the special allure of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore has been the ability to access the beach via 4 wheel drive vehicle. That has always been what was unique about a visit to Outer Banks. I personally, and for that matter many of my friends, have always respected and obeyed the regulations regarding beach access. I have always taken care to ensure I did my best not to disturb						

any wildlife encountered on the beach. I have also impressed upon any friends who visited the Cape Hatteras Seashore with me of the importance of being proper stewards of the beach and think of how our actions could affect the environment. On a number of occasions I have relayed information on the presence of turtles to the appropriate park rangers to help in their identification of nesting areas. As I have gotten older, I have introduced my family to the beauty of the Cape Hatteras Seashore, and have always educated my children in the importance of respect for the environment and need to be responsible for one's actions when visiting the Outer Banks, especially in off-road vehicles. I was severely disappointed with the National Park Service's decision to severely limit access to the beach for off-road vehicles. In fact, in 2009, it resulted in reducing my visits to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore from an average of 5 visits a season to one visit. I feel the unique beauty and treasures of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore should be available to all. As I get older, the ability to access the beach via off-road vehicle enables me and my family to enjoy the relative remoteness of the Outer Banks without having to park in designated parking areas and walk long distances carrying heavy loads. I am a believer in enforcement of the regulations that restrict behavior that can cause damage to the dunes and nesting areas of the birds and other wildlife that live and visit the seashore. Education and strong sanctions of individuals who deliberately disobey regulations could ease the impact of humans on the environment without punishing those of us who obey the rules. Please envoke my voice as one of the many who feel restriction of off-road vehicles on the beaches of the Cape Hatteras Seashore has served to detract from the uniqueness of the area as one of the great places of National Park Service. There must be another solutions to the off-road vehicle beach access issue to allow others to enjoy the beauty of the Outer Banks as much as I have enjoyed them.

Correspondence ID: 13615 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Letso, Michael G
Received: May,11,2010 10:31:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I've been visiting Hatteras since 1982.I love Hatteras.I love nature.I come to Hatteras because of the freedom I have to experience and enjoy the natural beauty of the island.That is because it was given by the people to you with your promise to keep it for us to enjoy and experience as a recreational area.Please consider that you have already broken that promise.You are being controlled by politics,doing wrong to all who love this beautiful place with all of these unnecessary closures and restrictions.Peaa Island,Portsmouth Island,Cape Lookout and yes,even much of Hatteras and Ocracoke already had more than enough pristine,natural,wild refuge before this sinful war against all who love these islands began years ago.Now you are forcing your power,the power of 'environmental'groups against the lives,livelihoods and homes of 'we the people' of Hatteras and Ocracoke.This is America,and we are Americans,and your decisions against the promise you made to us all these years are not according to the spirit of who we are and where we live and vacation.You know full well that you are taking away our land,and ignoring our pleas to stop,and for this you should re-consider,be honest and courageous and give us back our land. The 'environmental' groups are hateful,dishonest people who are on a self-righteous crusade to take away lands and access to American lands from Americans under wholly false pretenses.The people own this land,this Hatteras,and there are no 'environmental' groups here,only people who love this environment so much they choose to live or vacation here.It is the most beautiful of all the seashores in the world,and it was that way before you arrived,and it was just fine before these 'environmental' groups made us their target.I ask you to please remember who you are and who you represent and be an American and give this land back to us,as it is we the people to whom it belongs.Please.

Correspondence ID: 13616 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Pollock, Stephen C
Received: May,11,2010 10:32:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: In developing the ORV plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore the NPS has linked pedestrian and vehicle use together, and proposes resricions on both. Shouldn't pedestrian access be considered as a seperate issue when drafting an Off Road Vehicle Plan? Would it not be better in most cases, if not all, to allow pedestrian access to the beachfront and the soundfront in the Seashore? By adopting a plan that bans pedestian access even below the high tide line, where no birds nest, and no turtle nests are usually found, isn't the NPS being overly restrictive without reason?

Correspondence ID: 13617 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:32:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Thank you for taking the time to read my comments. My husband and I started bringing my children here since they were infants. Thirty years of vacationing here evolved into eleven years of living here full-time. I honor the Hatteras Island and the people here who honor every aspect of life, be it birds, fish, wildlife or each other. I strongly disagree with the way the DEIS deals with the heritage of the islanders, of which I now considered myself one. I spent some time reading around this 800 page document and am amazed at its complexities. How do you expect people to read and understand all of these proposed policy changes without any educational workshops put forth by the National Park Service? So, I went to the area of the DEIS that dealt with the Cultural and Historical Values. Why in a document that is so large and detailed was only two paragraphs given to this important subject. For thousands of years, people have been on island's beaches. From foot, to horseback and eventually, the automobile, people have used the beaches for travel. The wet sand next to the ocean is the easiest to drive on. The birds don't nest next to the ocean. Many cultural activities are centered around the beach like the jamborees, weddings and family gatherings ? for hundreds of years. On page 83, the DEIS talks about the ORV access as being historic in nature. Since these activities go back more than 50 years, I believe that qualifies the island for protection, not the destruction of Hatteras Culture. The DEIS fails miserably in this category. Also, for all the decades I have been here, the people on the beach (fisherman, surfers, sunbathers) have enjoyed the environment not destroyed it as suggested through the DEIS. The 15 miles set aside for Pea Island is a huge amount of land. Why do the National Park Service seem so intent on taking the Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore, too, when I don't see much of an argument to justify this action in the DEIS. Watching the effects of the Consent Decree which is now in its 3rd season, has been heartbreaking to watch my friends and neighbors now struggle to make a living. I didn't see how the Park Service was going to give the residents a bale out when the effects of the DEIS take hold.

Correspondence ID: 13618 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Sir:
I disagree with DEIS permanent closure of Hatteras Spit. (P.11) There's nothing left for birds to nest without getting nests washed away. The closure should be 3.1 miles-Bone Rd to Rip at Hatteras Inlet.

Correspondence ID: 13619 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Vachet, Charles D
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am opposed to all of the alternatives presented in the DEIS because they are all flawed in the fact they diminish the existing visitor experience and do not recognizing the socioeconomic and cultural resource impacts. None of the alternatives recognize the 12 or so miles of pedestrian only beaches contained within Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge. Yes, it is managed by the USFWS, but it is still contained within CAHA. This is a serious flaw.

Alternative A would require less restrictive wildlife closures, opening of interdunal roads, and free (or minimal cost) education and permits for ORV users in order for it to be acceptable.

Alternative B should be completely removed from consideration in this document. A court ordered consent decree, with arbitrary and capricious rules, that were not vetted properly in the NEPA process do not belong in this document as a viable alternative. Unprecedented wildlife closures, no pass through corridors, closures disturbance penalties, and unsubstantiated night time driving restrictions are all new rules brought on by the consent decree. How do non-NEPA vetted rules now become part of every alternative (except alt A), including the preferred alternative?

In the effort to manage wildlife at CAHA, pedestrian and ORV usage is being unfairly portrayed as a significant factor affecting nesting success of birds, even birds not even listed on the U.S. Endangered Species List. The proposed buffers for nesting birds are not based in peer reviewed science, and are not standards used anywhere else on NPS managed lands. In essence the public is being penalized where predation and storms are the true factors to lack of nesting success.

This penalization diminishes the existing visitor experience. Species on North Carolina's list of concern certainly shouldn't trigger closures like those species listed on the U.S. Endangered Species List. In addition, buffers for those species on the U.S. Endangered Species List are excessive, not based on peer reviewed science, and serve only to penalize the visiting public.

Night time driving restrictions are part of every alternative to protect sea turtles (except alt A), yet the science does not exist that proves night time driving affects the turtles. Pass through corridors for ORVs behind nests, any time of day or night, should be part of a preferred alternative.

Proposed year round closures at any points or spits should not be considered, particularly when suitable habitat is available elsewhere. This is another reason that Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge should be recognized in all alternatives. In addition, dredge spoil islands adjacent to CAHA should be recognized as suitable habitat, and any nesting success there should be attributed to CAHA.

Safety closures in front of the villages should continue from mid May to mid September and re open for the remainder of the time. This rule should also be consistently applied to the villages of Hatteras and Frisco.

Also, the pet restrictions from March through July need to be removed from consideration because leash laws will prevent any incidents with pets.

The sound side access locations in the document seem to be lacking. A better and more complete inventory of sound side access needs to be included in the final document.

This Seashore is unique from all others in that multiple villages and communities exist inside the boundary of the park. Impacts to these town and communities are more acute than to surrounding communities whenever the Parks Service institutes rules. I don't believe the alternatives in this document have properly evaluated the socioeconomic and historical and cultural impacts to these communities contained therein. The large ROI mentioned is too large to adequately assess the economic impacts to the villages. And very little is addressed in terms of historic access to the shoreline. This National Seashore was created so many years ago with the national public's diminishing access to the shoreline in mind, due to privatization of the beach. Its primary mission was people first. It was meant to be long open stretches of beach for those people not fortunate enough to live on the water. This document and these alternatives do nothing to further that initial goal. Instead, it seeks to chop up this National Seashore into little manageable pieces, where the visiting public and the people that live there suffer the most.

Please address these deficiencies in the final document. Or, put the "Coalition for Beach Access" position statement in as the preferred alternative.

Thank you,

Dave Vachet 127 W. Gilpin Ave. Norfolk, VA 23503

Correspondence ID: 13620 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Perdue, Bev
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR 20301 MAIL SERVICE CENTER ? RALEIGH, NC 27699-0301 BEVERLY EAVES PERDUE GOVERNOR LOCATION: 116 WEST JONES STREET ? RALEIGH, NC ? TELEPHONE: (919) 733-5811
WWW.GOVERNOR.STATE.NC.US
May 11, 2010
Mr. Mike Murray Superintendent, Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, North Carolina 27954
Dear Mr. Murray: I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-road Vehicle Management Plan. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is truly one of the treasures of our State, and I take very seriously the need for a balanced management approach for this important resource.
Based on the analysis provided in the DEIS, I believe you and your staff are working to include the economic, social, cultural, recreational and environmental dimensions of this complex issue in the new Management Plan. However, I also believe there are a number of local concerns related to Alternative F that need to be fully addressed. In particular, the Dare County analysis of Alternative F raises several key points, including how corridors, buffers and other practices can be better used to address species management issues and how local businesses are adversely affected by limiting beach access. The history of managing this beautiful Seashore shows that local support and buy-in is crucial to the success of any management approach. I strongly encourage you to take these local concerns seriously and develop appropriate responses to them as you continue working on the new Management Plan.
Any plan that is adopted by the National Park Service must provide an open and accessible beach for the public while also protecting this fragile environment. An effective and sustainable plan must also address Seashore's vital role in the local economy and in the social and cultural lives of local communities. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the DEIS and I thank you for your continued attention to these issues as the process moves forward.
Sincerely, Bev Perdue

Correspondence ID: 13621 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:36:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Management Buffers Concerning the species to be protected: The buffers outlined in DEIS pages 121 to 127 are for all species of concern as well as endangered species. This protection is appropriate as any species that is "of concern" or "threatened" or "endangered" could not possibly thrive under the continually increasing threat of ORV use in Cape Hatteras National Seashore. All else being equal it is predictable that in the coming years there will be even more visitors to the seashore. While most ORV users (I being the owner and driver of an ORV) would not willfully damage a nest or fledgling bird, the nests, eggs and fledglings are camouflaged in such a way as to be practically invisible to even a slowly moving vehicle. Concerning the size of buffers: Adequate buffers for the nests and fledglings are crucial. I trust that the best science available will be used to establish the scope of these buffers be they 200 yards or 1000 yards.

Correspondence ID: 13622 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Giannotti, Nancy C
Received: May,11,2010 10:37:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I agree that the birds need SOME protection. I Disagree with the amount that is closed in the Preferred alternative f plan of the park. If all the closure in this plan goes into effect the impact on the people on Hatteras will be horrible. Jobs will be lost and house cannot be sold (know one here to buy them if the beaches are closed)therefore people cannot move for they cannot buy unless they sell. Has the National Park thought of this? Has an economical survey been made? Please think of the people's lives first.

Correspondence ID: 13623 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
 May 5, 2010
 Mr. Murray,
 It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be needed to achieve this goal. Thank you for evaluating the options to improve the environmental conditions at one of the greatest destinations in the United States of America.
 However, with the aforementioned said, please consider the responses you choose carefully. Minimalist environmental management approaches have worked well throughout the United States' National Parks. Closing extensive sections of beaches, the sound, and water ways will strip away the very nature and reason for why we appreciate the land in its current state. It can be said with great certainty that all frequent and casual users of this place intend to preserve its natural beauty and respect its wildlife.
 We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.
 Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.
 If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment?
 Thank you,
 Robert Giroux

Correspondence ID: 13624 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: McGlone, Colleen
Received: May,11,2010 10:41:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please keep motorized vehicles off the beach! It is a place for quiet contemplation and nature - not noise and chaos. The wildlife would never recover. Please reconsider your plan.

Correspondence ID: 13625 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Wald, Michael
Received: May,11,2010 10:41:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly disagree with the approach that the NPS has taken to this situation. While the NPS has a duty to protect the wildlife in the Park and should take measures to do so, the NPS also has a duty to protect the public's right to use and enjoy the Park. Simply closing off hundreds of acres of random land because a certain bird has decided to nest there is not the answer. For a start, where is the data that says that a 1,000 meter perimeter is appropriate? It could very well be that a 50 meter perimeter is adequate. More importantly, there does not appear to be any restriction on where that perimeter can be located. If a bird nests near a road, do you close the road? Of course not. Of direct concern to me and other homeowners is what happens if a bird nests near my home. Do I now have to walk more than a half a mile away just to get to the beach, or possibly even access my own home? That is simply unreasonable. Again, where is the data/research to say that a person walking through the sand even 50 meters away from a bird nest is disruptive in any way. Or how about a vehicle driving near the water's edge 100 meters away from the dunes where nests may be present. And where does NPS possibly come up with justification for the restriction on dogs being on the beach when they are on a leash? If a dog is within 6 feet of a human, how is it a threat to a bird nesting area? Clearly dog owners must be responsible for cleaning up after their dogs, but how does a seasonal restriction on dog walking on the beach possibly enhance bird nesting? It just makes no sense to me and gives me even more concern about the foundation for any of the NPS's proposal. Again, policy decisions should be based on sound scientific data and accepted or proven methods. The current proposal does not appear to be based on either.
 The NPS has to recognize that one of the principle uses of the Park is beach access. Denying people the opportunity to have ready access to the beaches from their homes is simply unacceptable. There are designated pre-existing access ways through the dunes to the beaches which have existed for a long time and these access areas should not be closed except under extreme conditions. The NPS also has to recognize that there is a significant economic impact to the region that will result from it's actions. If people cannot have easy access to the beaches to enjoy them, then they will not come and the local economy will be severely affected. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore has been a growing and thriving recreational area for decades. Many families have been coming to visit for generations and there is a strong history to be respected here. The proposed actions of the NPS could destroy a significant part of these traditions and memories and history.
 This entire situation was created because the NPS mis-handled the development of this area in the past. It is simply not fair to now punish all of the users of this area due to the errors of the NPS in the past. The NPS should be using its own resources and funds to solve this problem in an equitable manner, not simply closing off vast areas of the park and thus making the users of the park pay for the mistakes of the NPS. This appears to be another example of a government agency simply passing the buck, and causing hardship on others to make up for its own mistakes.
 What is most troubling is the failure of the NPS to simply use the time-tested and well-accepted doctrine of "designated use" in solving this problem. If the NPS would simply designate bird nesting areas and then use it's own resources to "promote" these areas - possibly constructing perimeter protection, making the terrain more friendly to the birds, maybe even providing nesting materials and food - then the birds would benefit and the homeowners and visitors in the developed areas of the Park would not have to suffer. Doesn't it make sense that the bird population would be much more likely to recover if they were in managed, protected areas than in random uncontrolled spots near developed areas? Of course it does and yet NPS does not seem to consider this. The current approach appears to ignore the fact that there are other threats to the bird population than people. There are natural predators, high winds, food shortages, and other conditions which can be minimized in a designated use area. I expect these situations are much more of a threat to these birds than someone walking by 50 meters away. I simply cannot understand why the NPS fails to recognize this very basic concept of resource management, and that is very troubling.
 In summary, I implore the NPS to pursue a more reasonable and less restrictive approach to this situation. I respectfully submit that both the birds and the humans will be better off with a more reasonable solution, based on science and not emotion.

Correspondence ID: 13626 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Pollock, Stephen C
Received: May,11,2010 10:41:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I don't agree with the adaptive management decisions that clearly show a bias towards creating a habitat for certain types of birds by actively clearing natural vegetation. Cape Hatteras National Seashore was created for the enjoyment and use of the people. Manipulative techniques to encourage or discourage certain birds are best left to established wildlife refuges.

Correspondence ID: 13627 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 10:42:04
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: There should be NO OFF ROAD VEHICLES access on the barrier islands. These islands are home to endangered wildlife, and endangered plants. They are natural habitats that must be preserved. Can we not have places in this world that are NOT constantly polluted by the noise of motors and the smell of oil and gasoline? Please please do not allow this.

Correspondence ID: 13628 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Young, Kenneth
Received: May,11,2010 10:42:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the proposed restrictions on pedestrian and off road vehicle (ORV) access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. Predators have a larger impact on protected wildlife populations than do vehicles or pedestrians. ORV and other recreational uses would NOT have long term major adverse impacts on sea turtles as there have NOT been frequent deaths, nest lost, disorientation or hatchling mortality due to ORV use or night time beach driving. The proposed restrictions rely on information that is very limited in its scope and does not include the nearby dredge and spoil islands. Dredge and spoil island populations must be included in total population counts for accurate numbers and activity. I disagree with the size of the buffer zones proposed. There is no good scientific research to validate such large buffers. I disagree with the pet restrictions proposed. As long as people are allowed on the beaches of our recreation area, then controlled pets should be allowed on a six foot leash. Not allowing pets is in direct conflict with "the continued traditional, historical and cultural uses" of the entire beach. I disagree with the proposed beach closures. They are far too restrictive and will cause a major impact to local economy due to major impairment of the visitor experience and provide negligible benefit to resources. Further restrictions to ORV and pedestrian access to beaches is not necessary due to restrictions already in place at Pea Island Wildlife Refuge. Also, large buffers and closures would force more people into smaller areas, leading to overcrowding and possible greater resource impact to those areas. And finally, I disagree with the proposed restrictions to ORV access because beach driving is the traditional and only practical way of accessing the beach for elderly, impaired and handicapped persons (such as my mother). Why are they being discriminated against?

Correspondence ID: 13629 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:42:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do all that you can to insure that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area remains a RECREATIONAL area for everyone, and NOT a bird sanctuary. The very livelihoods of many of the folks in the surrounding villages is dependent on free and open access to the beaches by visitors and locals alike.
I am now a grandmother. I began coming here as a child in the 50's. I was able to play on and fish from the beaches of Cape Hatteras with my family. It was here where some of my fondest memories with my father were made. In the '60's, I loved to come with my friends and play and fish on the open beaches. Then, in the 70's, I started bringing my own children, and we began making OUR memories in the place I love. They were taught to be good stewards of the land, just as I was taught. Now, my Grandchildren may not have the same access and freedom to make their own memories. My eldest grandson is possibly the only one who will have ANY memory of a free and open area. The place where his great-grandparents, his grandparents, and his parents once were allowed to fish, swim, sun, walk, beachcomb and camp, is no longer open and available to him. EVENTHOUGH it was promised to him, and the rest of us generations ago, it is now being overregulated and even closed off in many areas, by overzealous, close-minded, single points of view people, who don't seem to have a compromising bone in their bodies!
We know how to take care of the land and its creatures. We have been doing so for generations. PLEASE use common sense and reach an agreement that is fair to EVERYONE. PLEASE allow Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area to be just that,...a "RECREATIONAL" area.

Correspondence ID: 13630 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Bartone, Robin L
Received: May,11,2010 10:43:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with parkplanning to set aside 1000 meters for the piping clover. This is too much of the beach to set aside. I agree that 300 meters would be enough beach to set aside for nature. This way we can all share this beautiful beach that God has blessed us with. Elderly folks cannot get to the beach where they can enjoy it without garbage and debris unless they go to the wonderful beaches of National Seashore. The humans that use this beach have kept it clean and useful to all for many years. So, like the people of Cape Cod, let's give nature 300 meters and continue to care for and share the beach. Signed, Robin L. Bartone and family members from Ashtabula, Ohio.

Correspondence ID: 13631 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:44:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
I urge you to reconsider the use of ORV on the beaches of Cape Hatteras. Beaches should be for foot traffic only, in my opinion. Beach erosion is a problem everywhere. With climate change, stronger storms and hurricanes are predicted and will cause even more drastic erosion. To allow ORVs on the beaches is irresponsible. Their tracks do amazing damage. Before approving any such plan, I think you ought to demand a high vehicle use fee for such items and should engage ORV "clubs" to enter into an agreement to do trail maintenance on a regular basis.
Again, I urge you to deny use of ORVs on the beaches of Cape Hatteras.
Sincerely,
Vivienne Lenk

Correspondence ID: 13632 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:45:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am also asking for an extension on the Document: 2010 03Mar 05 - Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS

Correspondence ID: 13633 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My name is Chuck Antle. I am a lifelong resident of North Carolina and property owner on Hatteras Island. I disagree with the six alternatives included in the DEIS. I support the plan formulated by the Coalition for Beach Access. I believe it is an improved version of the regulations in place up until 2004, that were based on the 1978 draft plan. All the alternatives in the DEIS favor overly aggressive resource protection at the expense of the public's access to the beaches of Hatteras Island. Science shows the main threat to wildlife on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is mother nature. Human affect is minimal. Yet the DEIS proposes very restrictive measures to prohibit people from the beaches. I do not see how this is going to make any significant difference. The resource closures for birds are beyond excessive. They appear to be based on what is mandated by the Consent Decree. The CD has not shown improvement in fledged birds over the resource protection of the past, nor is there any science to back up such large closures. I support more reasonable sized closures, such as 200M for piping plovers instead of 1000M. Regarding birds that are only on a list of concern in North Carolina, I support regulations that are similar to the state procedures. I believe night access restrictions for turtles are unwarranted and the practice of not moving nests in areas prone to overwash is wrong. I support the document from OBPA, Larry Hardham and Bob Davis (<http://www.obpa-nc.org/turtles/TurtleMgmtProgram.pdf>). I think resource closures are unfairly targeted towards the most popular parts of the seashore, that being the spits and cape point. This causes spillover/overcrowding in the remaining open areas, which can only lead to limits being placed on the number of people allowed access. The economic impact of the six alternatives in the DEIS is greatly underestimated. The past three years under the Consent Decree have been devastating to the economy of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. Including areas north of Oregon Inlet in any economic analysis is very misleading. I do not support the new restrictions on pets. There are sufficient regulations already in place. The new rules banning dogs from the beach most of the year only punish law abiding citizens. I think Pea Island should be taken into account when counting wildlife and when calculating pedestrian only areas. It is part of the park, regardless of whether the NPS manages it.

Correspondence ID: 13634 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Fischer, Richard J
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 One of my fondest memories of the 1990s is a bicycle ride I made through the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I camped at several campsites, I spent time birding, swimming, and watching dolphins. I often just sat and watched the waves and enjoyed the sounds the wind carried to me. Yes, some of the sound was the traffic route 12, but the speed limits, and the dunes mitigated that. I am so happy that I was able to enjoy the beeches and campsites with out having to share them with Off Road Vehicles. It is my hope that this area will remain free of ORVs forever. The tranquility and peace of the undeveloped beeches, marshes, woodlands is something I hope to share with my grandchildren in the not to distant future. There are so few wilderness areas left i the lower 48 that we need to protect each and every one. We need to create more, not abuse the ones we have. Please keep the Cape Hatteras National Seashore free of ORV.
 The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
 1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
 2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
 Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
 3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
 Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 13635 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:47:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The National Seashore is exactly that -- it was created as a national park to preserve the seashore for the enjoyment of generations of PEOPLE to come. The OUTER BANKS is an extremely sensitive habitat area, but the people who live along this coastal area live in harmony with the wildlife -- in fact more turtle nests are damaged each year since trying to protect them and creating 'human free' zones. It is the humans who are generally keeping the turtles predators at bay!
 The Outer Banks is also an area of economic prosperity, which is largely dependent on the beach, tourism and customer services. At one time, fishing was a mainstay for the local people as well, but that's become more and more difficult to maintain and earn a good living due to legislative efforts. Without tourism, this area with fail to thrive and Dare and the surrounding counties would most likely go bankrupt. The people living on the Outer Banks would most likely lose their jobs (supporting the industry), property values would fall, sales taxes would decline -- which would decimate the local economy and industry.
 My family and I love the environment and this is one remaining location (that we're aware of) on the eastern seaboard where we can enjoy the beach, the ocean, the people and the beauty; in a relatively unspoiled environment. We all do our part to maintain OUR National Seashore. We as citizens have the right to enjoy and spend time on our beaches - next to nature. Do NOT deny us that right to recreate and co-habitate in one of the few remaining wonders along the east coast.

Correspondence ID: 13636 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:48:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My name is Donna Antle. I am a longtime resident of North Carolina and property owner on Hatteras Island. I disagree with the six alternatives included in the DEIS. I support the plan formulated by the Coalition for Beach Access. I believe it is an improved version of the regulations in place up until 2004, that were based on the 1978 draft plan. All the alternatives in the DEIS favor overly aggressive resource protection at the expense of the public's access to the beaches of Hatteras Island. Science shows the main threat to wildlife on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is mother nature. Human affect is minimal. Yet the DEIS proposes very restrictive measures to prohibit people from the beaches. I do not see how this is going to make any significant difference. The resource closures for birds are beyond excessive. They appear to be based on what is mandated by the Consent Decree. The CD has not shown improvement in fledged birds over the resource protection of the past, nor is there any science to back up such large closures. I support more reasonable

sized closures, such as 200M for piping plovers instead of 1000M. Regarding birds that are only on a list of concern in North Carolina, I support regulations that are similar to the state procedures.

I believe night access restrictions for turtles are unwarranted and the practice of not moving nests in areas prone to overwash is wrong. I support the document from OBPA, Larry Hardham and Bob Davis (<http://www.obpa-nc.org/turtles/TurtleMgmtProgram.pdf>).

I think resource closures are unfairly targeted towards the most popular parts of the seashore, that being the spits and cape point. This causes spillover/overcrowding in the remaining open areas, which can only lead to limits being placed on the number of people allowed access.

The economic impact of the six alternatives in the DEIS is greatly underestimated. The past three years under the Consent Decree have been devastating to the economy of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. Including areas north of Oregon Inlet in any economic analysis is very misleading.

I do not support the new restrictions on pets. There are sufficient regulations already in place. The new rules banning dogs from the beach most of the year only punish law abiding citizens.

I think Pea Island should be taken into account when counting wildlife and when calculating pedestrian only areas. It is part of the park, regardless of whether the NPS manages it.

Correspondence ID: 13637 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Pollock, Stephen C
Received: May,11,2010 10:49:57
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the proposed ORV plan as being overly restrictive. I think, since the vast majority of vehicle and pedestrian use is concentrated in a narrow area below the high tide line, where impact to the natural environment is minimal, and no nesting birds are found, that vehicles and pedestrians should be allowed reasonable access to those areas.

Correspondence ID: 13638 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Farr, Janice
Received: May,11,2010 10:51:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please, there must be a good balance between preservation of the piping plovers and turtles nesting and the public's ability to access the beach for recreation and family enjoyment. The proposal suggested by the NPS is far too restrictive. Let's work towards a compromise position that better balances the needs of all stakeholders. Thanks!

Correspondence ID: 13639 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:52:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13640 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
Dear Superintendent Murray,
I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternate D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, both of which are important to me.
As the government entity charged with protecting natural resources within National Parks and Seashores, I believe it is your responsibility to put the protection of natural resources first. If protecting natural resources is the first priority then all recreational activities should conform to that protection even if this means the recreational activity is limited or constrained by this protection. The Outer Banks in general, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore specifically, provide critical nesting habitat for seabirds, shorebirds and sea turtles. Cape Hatteras National Seashore is also a critical stop over area for migrating shorebirds which are already stressed throughout much of their wintering and breeding ranges. The National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, does not do enough to limit year-around ORV activity in areas that are critical to wildlife. More of Cape Hatteras National Seashore needs to be free of ORV use and set aside for wildlife protection. Also, wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased to enhance the protection of breeding birds and sea turtles.
Any management plan should have the ability to be flexible if it is to be effective. If protection of the Seashore's natural resources is first priority then goals and objectives for wildlife recovery should be set. The plan should have the ability to adjust if these goals and objectives are not being realized - including adding more protective measures if they are needed in order to facilitate recovery. I believe these goals and objectives should take into account what the Seashore has historically supported with regard to wildlife and not what it currently is capable of supporting in its degraded condition.

This plan should be able to mitigate damage done over the years and allow Cape Hatteras Seashore to recover its former glory. The current preferred plan does not provide equal access to all visitors as ORVs would be prohibited year around on only 16 of the 68 miles of the Seashore. This does not represent a fair balance for all users. If ORV use will continue to be allowed in the Park then there needs to be a more equitable balance between areas where ORVs are allowed and where they are not allowed. I feel that at least 50% of the Seashore should be set aside for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide more balanced access for all visitors. This more multi-use approach would be better for the many non-ORV visitors and would allow wildlife the ability to recover to its traditional numbers and diversity.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts 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, David Davenport Zoologist and President - EcoQuest Travel, Inc. 459 Go Cart Road Four Oaks, NC 27524

Correspondence ID: 13641 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:52:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13642 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:52:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13643 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:52:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13644 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.

Considering the recent tragic oil spill in the Gulf, it's time for our governmental agencies to do their job! Please protect the rare birds and sea turtles on the Cape Hatteras Seashore to the fullest extent possible. Don't let the lobbyists have their way. They have done far too much damage to our country and the environment already! It's time to stop the rule of profits!

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13645 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hales Gordo, Carla P
Received: May,11,2010 10:53:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Sir/Madam:

I grew up on the shores of North Carolina and I am dismayed to learn that allowing vehicles on our Hatteras beaches is even under consideration. What is the purpose? The only response I can think of is to make the ocean easily accessible. To what end? So, the beach-goers do not have to walk to their favorite tanning or fishing spot.

What is the possible harm? Presently, we have an alarming amount of beach erosion and our sandy beaches are eroding at an even more alarming rate. Passing this legislation will increase the rates of erosion. How? I could write for days on the whys of disallowing vehicles on the beach, but I will simply make a small argument. I am certain some off-roaders will choose to cross over the dunes (although it is illegal) in order to access the beach. Our dunes are the beaches stability point and the sea oats are the sentries of the dunes. If a vehicle barrels over the dune, the precious balance is lost. Which would you prefer, a couple of decades of short term off-road fun or a forever of losing our incredibly beautiful Hatteras coastline.

Paige Hales-Gordo Concerned NC Citizen

Correspondence ID: 13646 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:57:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: After decades of vacationing here on Hatteras Island, my wife and I retired to Frisco, NC eleven years ago. Frisco is one of the 8 villages located within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area and residents stand to loose so much from what I have read in the DEIS. Nothing that I read satisfied my concerns for the local economy and real estate values and I feel that the DEIS failed to adequately address.

The Region of Influence which was described starting with page 270 deals with Hatteras Island incorrectly. The northern beaches, the southern beaches and Ocracoke Island are grouped together in the DEIS and this is wrong. The northern beaches do not rely on ORV or pedestrian access for their customers. The people who vacation there generally visit the historical sites like Ft Raleigh and Wright Bros. monument. These are not the same type of person who generally recreates on Hatteras. These people are rugged and enjoy the things that nature provides like fishing, surfing, bird watching, windsurfing, kitesurfing, etc. Throwing the towns of Southern Shores and Duck into this grouping is wrong and incorrect, and throws the numbers out-of-whack. Hatteras and Ocracoke are nothing like the northern beaches. Also, Hatteras has about one-third the amount of visitors when compared to the area north of Oregon Inlet. Nowhere did I read where the overwhelming negative impacts on local businesses were acknowledged.

Additionally, I understand that there were no surveys done with the local businesses on Ocracoke and Hatteras Islands. Given the "test run" that was provided because the area has been operating under the Consent Decree for two complete seasons, I think businesses have a perfect idea what the DEIS will do to their income considering how much more restrictive Alternative F is over the Consent Decree.

In my opinion, there are so many flawed key assumptions in the DEIS.

Correspondence ID: 13647 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 10:58:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My husband and I have been vacationing in Avon, NC, for the past two years and are scheduled to return for a third year next May. We go there with a

0012568

group of friends who have been going for many more years than we have. The allure of vacationing in Avon is the ability to take our dogs with us and take them on the beach. Our dogs are both American Kennel Club Canine Good Citizens and both are also registered therapy dogs through Therapy Dogs International. They are well behaved and obedient and we are very respectful of our surroundings. We NEVER allow our dogs off leash on the beach. We do not allow our dogs to veer off the path on the dunes leading to the beach. We ALWAYS clean up our dogs' waste. We do not allow our dogs to bark or otherwise disturb others. We keep our dogs under control at all times. We are very appreciative of the opportunity to share this beautiful stretch of beach with our canine companions. With that said, if access to the beach for our dogs was denied, we would NOT return to Avon to vacation each year. The purpose of our trip is spend a week with our friends, both human and canine. We rent a high-end oceanfront beach home for the week, we shop, eat, and entertain in the Hatteras Island area. In short, the money we spent on Hatteras Island will be spent elsewhere if our dogs are not allowed on the beach. While we are supportive of efforts to protect wildlife, please be conscious of the economic impacts of your actions. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13648 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:58:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The plan to restrict access to the beaches seems to be a continuation of the use of the endangered species act to limit use of public land and parks. In recent years several groups and organizations have used the courts to force the closure or restrictions on usage of land, in order to create some sort of wildlife refuge.
When our children were growing up we would come to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore to enjoy the beach and would spend all day doing all the things kids love to do. We were able to travel up and down the beach to locate small tidal pools and good fishing spots and just the right surf conditions to suit their age at the time. We would bring a tarp and a grill and spend the entire day enjoying the beach. Now that the kids are grown, we no longer visit the seashore as much, but we still enjoy coming down even if it is just for the day. The ORV plan makes it look like the trip will no longer be as enjoyable.
The whole idea to restrict access will only make a visit to the seashore less of an experience, and people's use of the seashore will be at the mercy of where a bird or turtle may choose to nest. I understand a few more endangered species may survive, but the reduced use and access will be of limited benefit. Unless the increase in the number of nests is large, and predator species can be controlled the end result will be nothing of any value. I feel sorry for future generations who will not have the full use and access to this very special place. With limited vehicle access the beach will become difficult for a lot of people to reach and visitors probably will feel the primary use of the National Seashore is to be some sort of sanctuary.

Correspondence ID: 13649 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 10:58:44
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: 13650 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Supt. Murray
Please accept this letter as my comments on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have, however reviewed the 77-page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Buffers in the Alternatives for piping plovers are extreme and unnecessary. The protections listed in the alternatives for AMOYs and colonial waterbirds are excessively restrictive; these birds are not federally threatened or endangered and do not deserve the levels of protection described.
Sincerely,
Ted Buckwalter

Correspondence ID: 13651 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Sir:
I disagree with DEIS restrictive management areas (p. 468) ML1 is overly restrictive. Pedestrian and ORV corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around, or below high tide line in all SMA's during entire breeding and nesting season (within guidelines) to maintain access. 1000 meter buffers are too large. Buffers should move with the brood as they relocate for food.

Correspondence ID: 13652 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Pollock, Stephen C
Received: May,11,2010 11:03:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I think the proposed ORV program is overly restrictive and does not take into account the traditional use and economic impact that closures to the seashore have on the local economy and to the local population. Science does not clearly show, and empirically prove, that reasonable use of vehicles at the seashore, below the high tide line and through corridors established to guide the vehicle traffic has any significant impact to wildlife whatever. I find the plan to overly restrictive to visitors by denying basic access to the Seashore for the people, while experimenting in an unfounded fashion to encourage a wildlife habitat. Reasonable restrictions call for maximizing the reasonable access to the Seashore at all times and minimizing the necessity to close beaches and prevent people from enjoying their natural resource.

Correspondence ID: 13653 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Gordon, Herb D

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have hosted a fishing TV show for over 12 years and have fished on the Outer Banks all of my life, also own property in the great state of NC. Have a Century Farm that has been in my family for 6 generations. I have a BS degree in Biology as well. The one thing I have learned which seems to be ignored by most all of us is that man should not mess with the balance of nature, all we do is make matters worse, what you do not know is what comes back to haunt you, this whole mess is gotten way out of hand and has not been handled like it should have been in the first place. I am 64 years old and have been an outdoors person both fishing and hunting since a young boy, am amazed at the way this process has grown into such a debacle over one specie!

Correspondence ID: 13654 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Rosemond, Carol H

Received: May,11,2010 11:04:27

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The NPS has a challenging job trying to protect the resources of the beaches and balance that charge with providing access to local, state citizens and other park visitors. The uniqueness of CHNS presents the challenge not of an isolated locale as are many parks but one interspersed with villages where people live and work. This in and of itself requires a different perspective on managing the park and therefore cannot necessarily utilize standardized management that may work well in other parks. IT IS NOT NOR SHOULD IT BE VIEWED OR CONSIDERED A WILDLIFE PRESERVE. The park originated to provide and make this wonderful natural asset available to PEOPLE. Additionally the NPS was not established to be regulatory agency nor should it be.

While some controls may be needed, I disagree with the NPS preference for Plan Alternative F. This plan is too restrictive and regulatory, and places the NPS into the role of enforcement police rather than educators of and for the treasures that the Cape Hatteras Seashore holds. I support the least restrictive plan that allows the human species access to our publicly owned and tax funded beaches while still providing some protections for wildlife and their habitats. NPS should be working with the local communities as Conrad Wirth did, rather than becoming an adversary. Certainly people that live and work in a community have a vested interest in the environment that supports their very livelihood.

The Pea Island Refuge provides a large extensive habitat for birds and other creatures. Restrictive areas in other park areas should be limited to endangered species with limited boundaries. Areas as large as 1000 feet are excessive for protection.(large inflexible buffers-p.121-127)

I disagree on the restriction for dogs and horses. Banker ponies were an essential part of the islands history and the allowance of horses continues this tradition of ocean riders who enjoy this recreational pursuit. Dogs on leashes should also be allowed as for many, their dog is indeed a family member.(p 136) I question how birds and turtles are entitled to protection but dogs and horses do not also have some "protective rights."

The sea, the shore and beaches affect the the lives of locals on a daily basis and often determines if they will work, go to school, the off island doctor etc. As a 6th generation island descendant with many family members residing on the island, I can attest the intertwining of the sea and beaches to the traditions, culture and vitality of island life. In fact a portion of the seashore was once property owned by family members. This tradition of reliance on the sea and surf zone is not given enough coverage or weight in the DEIS. The human species and its way of life should also be given the same protections and access as our smaller creatures.

Access to pursuits on our beaches are critical to life on the islands. They provide sustenance, income, relaxation, fun and community bonding experiences that cannot be provided elsewhere. Many of these traditional experiences have taken place at night or early morning prior to sunset at the Hatteras and Ocracoke Spits. (p.97-101) These are areas where the fishing and or shelling is often exceptionally good. Night time driving/ORV access maintains these traditions and activities.(p.104) Human access educates people of the ever changing shore and "grows" supporters and protectors which the NPS should strongly desire. The park with its interspersed villages and citizens should indeed merit a Traditional Cultural Property Designation, yet it is hardly included or considered in the 800 page document. This is contrary to the NPS guideline statement regarding Traditional Cultural Properties. I disagree with the method used in counting visitors. Only visitors that visit the barrier islands should be counted. A considerable number of visitors to Wright Memorial or Fort Raleigh never travel further out onto the islands. These numbers should not be included in the totals for visitors to the park beaches.

I disagree with the ROI that was used. The actual area of concern should be the island beaches. The entire environment is different from the Northern Beaches of Nags Head, Kitty Hawk, and Duck. Island businesses are mostly locally owned and there are few chains.

The socio-economic analysis of the DEIS document is INADEQUATE. Already the unpredictability of beach access is affecting businesses. Previously July 4th week was one of the busiest of the summer. During the past two years I have observed that 5 of 7 oceanfront cottages along and adjacent to the street of my cottage were empty at this time. Our cottage rentals have dropped at least one third over the past two years. Previously they stayed full at least 12 weeks during peak season. The ripple effect of un-rented cottages greatly affects islanders from those that clean, to restaurants to gift and grocery stores as well as deep sea and sound charters etc.

Access to tax paying citizens should be available at all times, even if some limitations are necessary. A key factor in ORV access is the accessibility it provides to citizens with disabilities. Based on information from the NC Office of Budget Management 21% of non-institutionalized adults consider themselves to have activity limitations and a disability. 20.5% of NC children have a disability or health condition. 39% of NC older adults 65 and older have one or more disabilities. ORV access provides many of this population their ONLY option to fish, or enjoy the ocean close up.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore IS NOT an isolated beach where you fence it, gate it or lock it up at night. Support by the public for the beaches and also the NPS is dependent upon their access to them. Pedestrian access should rarely be restricted and only limited guidelines are truly needed for ORV access.

The current proposed plan does not fully consider the impact upon the culture and tradition of the local community, the extreme impact upon local businesses and the economy which has already begun to be seen, and the recreational and educational pursuits of the community as well as visitors.

The proposed alternative F is overkill , too restrictive and unnecessary. In my career working in education, public recreation, and with people with disabilities the common denominator was to provide the least restrictive environment for people while still providing for their safety and well being. I strongly urge you to do the same for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a more reasonable approach to that Alternative F and encourage you to make alterations to your plan that includes the above mentioned items as well as works more closely with, and incorporates items found in the Coalition for Beach Access position statement and assessment. The members of the coalition are more directly involved in the daily activities of island life are not large national groups pushing a national cause with lobbyists.

Extreme regulatory control of our seashore is not needed and stands to increase animosity between the NPS and the local community. Work together to provide a continued protection for and enjoyment of our beaches for all citizens. By using a less restrictive, non regulatory approach both the citizens and NPS can benefit equally.

I support the issues and concerns brought forth by the Coalition for Beach access. While I am not a member of any of its groups I think they have approached the issues in a fair, reasonable and equitable manner. The lure of the sea and its shores have drawn man to its side forever. May it continue to do so. Do not significantly restrict access to our beaches. A more reasonable, less restrictive plan is what is needed at this time.

Thank you for providing the opportunity for comment.

Correspondence ID: 13655 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 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: 13656 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

I was born in NC and have always been a permanent resident of this fine state. I consider myself a nature lover, conservationist and fisherman. I was less than 5 years old when my parents first introduced me to our barrier islands. Over the years Ocracoke and Hatteras have been our primary vacations and weekend destinations. My two children literally grew up visiting the beach numerous times each year. They are grown up now and will shortly be introducing my first grandson to the islands. During my parents later years I return to the beach with them often. Without ORV many of these trips would have been impossible. Taking small children and elderly to the our beaches requires ORV use. Please consider the following points in making decisions about managing this valuable resource for the citizens of this great nation.

- 1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]."
- 2) No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations.
- 3) Page xxiv: Per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" Unnecessarily large enclosure will force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
- 4) Page xix and page 23: Having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F" makes no sense and has not scientific peer support. I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.
- 5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. This is impractical. Allowing the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area in not in alignment with ADA laws.
- 6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to our beaches.
- 7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.
- 8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.
- 9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%. The percentage due to human interference: just 3%. It's insignificant. NPS should change their efforts to where it will make the most benefit not ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.
- 10) The use of incorrect statistics of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park if just plain wrong. The NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and must be included to have any valid statistical truth.
- 11) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. The Northern Beaches in this analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages. Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Nowhere is it clearly addressed that

the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts. Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits.

11) Page 136: I disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The 6 foot lease rule in effect today should be carried forward. Pets are part of many families lives. This was proven during hurricane evacuations and recognized by FEMA. Do it right thing! 12) Pages 97- 101. I disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations. This denies public access to these beaches as there is not sufficient parking to support beach use.

13) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Scientific studies in support of this are not existent. Additional NC is at the northern most extent of turtle nesting and estimates are that only 2% return to NC. ORV lights on the beach are not impacting turtle nesting. More proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

Final thoughts which I hope you will consider:

Please, incorporate access corridors within your planning so the public can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much tax payer money and energy on overprotecting so few Piping Plover nest sites. The DEIS is extremely biased toward over protection and not considering the public's right to enjoy our beaches of the National Seashore.

Please preserve the citizens of this great nations access to share our beaches while performing your assigned duties of protecting shoreline wildlife. Thank you for consideration of my thoughts.

Correspondence ID: 13657 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: DEIS Comments: Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area

The enabling legislation created "The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area" for all to enjoy (beachcombers, sunbathers, surfers, horseback riders, anglers, hikers, joggers, wildlife observers, kayakers, swimmers, families, children, grandparents?). The park was never intended to be "The Cape Hatteras Special Interest Group Area for National Audubon Members Only!"

The legislation states: "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area." The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species. Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings. Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lightning, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreational Area. ATVs are not permitted. These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours.

The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas. South Beach is an unproductive Plover nesting area so access should be open year round to South Beach. I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles based on peer reviewed science. Who better to advocate preservation of area wildlife than the people whose lives and futures are intertwined to the success of each species?

I agree with these Shorebird / Water bird Buffers: Species Breeding Behavior/ Nest Buffer ORV Pass-through Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 m 30 m 200 m American Oystercatcher Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Least Terns 30 m 30 m 30 m Other Species CWB 30 m 30 m 30 m MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged.

Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

*** As part of the NEPA process, I Formally Request the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions.

MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters).

MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged.

I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreational Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with

inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator.

The science offered to support the environmentalist positions does not justify the extreme ORV and pedestrian access restrictions proposed in the DEIS. I believe ORV access to Cape Point, South Beach and Hatteras Inlet should not be restricted.

The proposed 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for a piping plover unfledged chick brood is extreme and scientifically unjustified. This equals approximately 771 acres per brood. The plover closure should be reduced to 200 meters.

The Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species and the proposed 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure is extremely excessive. The Oystercatcher closure should be reduced to 15 meters.

In my opinion, there is no scientific justification to deny human entry into large areas of the recreation area and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach.

I urge you to preserve our beaches, protect natural resources with common sense policies, but not prohibit ORV use and pedestrian access to any portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area at any time. Remember, the National Seashore Recreation Area was established for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of this country. How can future generations enjoy the area if access is severely restricted? CORRIDORS are vital in providing access while managing resources. MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on peer-reviewed science. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should NOT have the same protection as if endangered. TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation and other practices.

So, please save the communities of Hatteras Island and preserve the historic & cultural way of life of the people on this island for future generations to experience. There are many miles of unpopulated barrier islands on the east coast that are better suited to enhance shorebirds and turtles than Hatteras Island.

Thank You

Correspondence ID: 13658 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Kelly, Tim m

Received: May,11,2010 11:10:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My children are currently 9th generation Outer Bankers dating back to William Howard who passed away in 1724. My sons first four birthdays were spent at the point in Hatteras celebrating with several generations of our family as the family has for the last 280+ years. The economic impact of the Convent Decree has severely effected most residents on Hatteras Island.

I disagree with the following listed in the DEIS:

1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.

2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

3) Page six and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.

4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial

Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.

These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

As a lifelong resident of Hatteras Island, we of the Hatteras Island community have always gotten together on the south beach on Sunday to enjoy the beach with our cookouts, gatherings, surf bathing, horse shoes and foot races, fishing, and surfing. Now the DEIS is proposing closing off most of the south beach during the summer which is the traditional period we local people use the beach. The continuation of this traditional pattern of land use is central to maintaining the historic identity of our island communities.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period has ended.

Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial.

Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts.

Even businesses whose revenue has stayed level or showed a modest increase have accomplished this at a costly price. Many have had to cut back employee hours, forego much-needed capital improvements, and sacrifice profits. That is certainly the case with Hatteras Realty.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fisherman want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

Hatteras Realty books approximately 13,000 rental weeks for a total of 91,000 rental nights housing approximately 700,000 visitors. The ban on pets to July 31 will seriously hurt the rentals of my vacation homes as our pet homes encompass about 30% of our rentals. I propose allowing pets on 6 foot leashes year-round in all areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years.

17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date.

The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit."

Thank you,

Tim Kelly

Correspondence ID: 13659 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Graham, M. Eileen
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: May 11, 2010

Following are my comments about the DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the NPS for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

1. Page xxiv: I disagree with the NPS statement that "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront..." If huge sections of the beach are closed off, people will be forced into smaller areas, resulting in potentially more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.

2. Page xix and page 23: I disagree with having two different closure rules pertaining to the North-facing (north side) beaches and the South-facing (south side) beaches, according to the grid in "Alternative F." I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in the villages of Frisco, Hatteras, and Ocracoke longer than the traditional May 15 to Sept. 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. The May 15-Sept. 15 closed period should be apply to ALL villages.

3. Page 1: I agree with the statement that "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."

However, pedestrian-only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and people who engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as fishing rods and tackle, beach umbrellas, chairs, bookie boards or coolers.

4. Page 1: I disagree that DEIS responsibly addresses cultural resource issues. The purpose of the DEIS--as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)--is to protect and preserve natural AND cultural resources in the federal decision-making process. Please see the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" that appears in the first sentence of the plan's first page, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times later in the document. Why, then, does the document have only two paragraphs of analysis of these cultural resource issues?

One example of the short shrift given to cultural resources is the DEIS proposal to close off most of the south beach during the summer, which is the time that year-long Hatteras Island residents ("locals") traditionally use the south beach--typically on Sundays--for cookouts, get-togethers, swimming in the surf, fishing, surfing, and games. Maintaining this ages-old land-use pattern is necessary to the continued cultural identity of Hatteras Island communities.

5. Page 53: I disagree with the proposed guidelines for a special use permit.

Some conditions haven't been considered. For example, allowing the transportation of a disabled visitor to the village beaches by another person and then requiring the vehicle to be returned to the parking area, means that the driver must walk a long distance through the sand back to the place the disabled visitor has been dropped off and again hike back to vehicle when it's time to go. Also, in the event that the disabled visitor is capable of driving to the beach, he or she cannot go unless they have another person with them to drive their vehicle back to the parking lot. This ruling creates unnecessary hardships for the disabled and their families and friends, and even creates risks in the event of an emergency.

6. Pages 97-101: I strongly disagree with proposals in this section that ORVs will be prohibited year-round between ramps 27 and 30 at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Prohibiting ORV access equates to denying public access to these beaches, which are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road areas and are too far to reach on foot. In fact, there have been no breeding piping plovers or other endangered species in the Hatteras Island Inlet (Spit) area during the past six years.

7. Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night-time driving closures, prohibiting night-time driving from May 2 through November 15. These closures will force visitors off the beaches early in the evening and prevent sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. If one truly is needed, a shorter night-time ban--i.e., 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before midnight, June 1-Sept. 15--is much more practical and appropriate for all concerned.

8. Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings--including pedestrian access--from March 15-July 31 in eight different beach locations that have traditionally been open.

Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and others.

9. Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS's perspective that over-protects resource-management at the expense of the public's right to access the beaches.

Alternatively, please seriously consider proactive initiatives, including: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water Bird Social Attraction, Piping Plover Chick Fledge Rate, Piping Plover Chick Buffer Distance, and Pass-Through Buffers during the incubation period.

Also, opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the aforementioned initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

10. Pages 121-127: I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented.

Pass-through corridors must be provided. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering one side and the dune line on the other side. For instance, if you close access on one side of a 4-mile linear beach and prohibit access on the other side of that section of the beach with no pass-through corridor, then you have closed all 4 miles of the beach because people CANT get there. The bird buffers are excessive, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose pass-through-only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass-through corridors must be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Also, I believe the Piping Plover Unfledged Chicks Buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food sources and NOT be expanded. Most important, the 1,000-meter distance--an area almost equal in size to 10 football fields--for the Piping Plover is overkill and not based on peer-reviewed science. A more realistic distance would be the 200-meter distance observed at other Piping Plover sites in the U.S.--ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support the 200-meter buffer.

Buffers for other species such as American Oystercatchers, Least Terns, and other Colonial waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30-meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300-meter closure noted in the DEIS.

Non-endangered birds should not mandate the same protections as endangered species. Denying ORV access to these beaches with non-endangered birds is tantamount to denying public access to them.

11. Pages 125 and 392-396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the statistics and procedures proposed.

Endangered Sea Turtles would benefit from management practices now used in other Federal seashores that are more proactive in their efforts to achieve nesting success. These proactive efforts include relocating nests to more desirable locations and have proved successful in other state- and federally-controlled seashores. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle-nesting locations of the Southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. The proposed buffer areas on Cape Hatteras Seashore amount to overprotection of the turtles.

12. Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages," amounts to NO PETS in public areas--beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads, etc.--from March 15-July 31.

I own a home in Avon that rents as a "Pet House," where, for an additional cost, people may bring pets with them on vacation. If people cannot bring their pets into the National Seashore, my rental income will be severely impacted, as most of my income comes from guests with pets. Former guests, whom we have relied on season after season, will either leave their pets at home and NOT rent my house or they will leave their pets unsupervised in my house while they visit the seashore, resulting in damage to my property.

As a pet owner myself, I have observed the effectiveness of the present 6-foot leash law, and I strongly recommend allowing pets on 6-foot leashes in all Cape Hatteras National Seashore areas open to pedestrians or ORVs.

13. Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement, "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No piping plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. In fact, ORV violations continue to decrease with the improvement of signage and education of the public. And the violations that do occur seem more the result of NPS lack of manpower and enforcement than the willful and purposeful violation of the out-of-bounds areas by the public.

14. Pages 270-281 and 561-598: I strongly disagree with the NPS economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. Your region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach Communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores, and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

Including the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages. Moreover, analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages is significantly down-played in The DEIS, with emphasis on the ROI-wide or County-wide impacts. Worse, the DEIS IGNORES that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be borne by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xviii, Alternative "F" is presented as having "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

The negligible to moderate prediction is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that have not yet been published and are not expected to be added to the DEIS until after the public comment period is over.

Based on the economic hardships already experienced under the Consent Decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative "F" to be substantial. Consent Decree beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County businesses, causing lay-offs, job losses, loss of profit, postponement of needed property improvements, business closures, foreclosures, bankruptcies, and depletion of savings, college and retirement funds. Meanwhile, food banks and "soup kitchens" on Hatteras Island are hard-pressed to keep up with demand.

Pages 270-268 and 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses used are incomplete and erroneous, understating the effect the DEIS restrictions will have on Hatteras Island, the region, and the State of North Carolina. The NPS recommendation on page 383 that businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules is completely arbitrary and cruel. The negative impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN; therefore, to say that the new restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

15. Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided through, around or below the high-tide line in all SMAs during the entire breeding season to maintain access.

Additional comments:

Overall Visitor Counts

Overall Visitor Counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside the National Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh national Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual National seashore areas SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED in the counts that factor into the DEIS.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke

Alternative "F" socioeconomic analyses are made on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor "high season." In reality, under Alternative "F," the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fishermen want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is, they WON'T COME, and if they don't come, they don't rent my or any other vacation home. And they won't spend their money on Hatteras And Ocracoke islands.

Inaccurate Conclusions in the Socioeconomic Analyses

The DEIS socioeconomic analyses are rendered inaccurate because they are based on: 1). a flawed definition of the ROI, 2). faulty data about economic activity generated by specific type of recreational activity, 3). incomplete visitation/business survey data, 4). inflated overall National Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, 5). and flawed key assumptions concerning maintenance of access under Alternative "F." Specifically, these inaccuracies understate the negative socioeconomic impact on the Seashore Villages. Moreover, the negative impact will be felt almost entirely by small businesses. Neither of these concerns has been adequately represented in the DEIS.

In Conclusion:

I disagree with the NPS Resource Management pedestrian/ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival, with little chance for more than a negligible impact. In example, the American Oyster Catcher Nest failures are predominantly due to non-human causes. Using your own figure: Mammalian (non-human) predation causes 54% of failures, storm/lunar tides cause 29%, nest abandonment equates to 6%, avian predation is responsible for 5%, and ghost crab predation equals 3%. Human interference comes in at the end with a mere 3% cause of nest failures. Why, then, does the NPS want to so severely limit human activity when it causes very little negative impact on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles?

It is unreasonable to spend so much time, money and energy protecting a bird--the Piping Plover--that is on the southernmost fringe of its breeding ground, in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Likewise, the same can be said for the Loggerhead Turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area here. Please scale back these buffer zones. They can be increased at a later date if needed.

In the proposed DEIS, the National Park Service has taken extreme measures to overprotect these species while nearly disregarding the public's right to enjoy the beaches in what is supposed to be the National Seashore Recreational Area. Please balance these two concerns in a more reasonable and equitable way with a plan that inspires not hurt and anger but respect among both native and local Hatteras islanders and the visiting public.

Additional Recommendations:

Please incorporate access corridors through any SMA so people can get to the open beach beyond.

Also, DO count the birds that nest on the Spoil Islands.

Base your buffer zones on peer-reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distance. Respectfully, M. Eileen Graham Hatteras Island property owner

Correspondence ID: 13660 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 11:12:07

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have a second home in Buxton and have been coming to the Outer Banks for outdoor recreation, specifically the Buxton-Frisco area, for in excess of 45 years. Though there is much I disagree with in the proposals, the following are some points I would like to stress. It makes no sense to me to have different restriction periods for the North and South beaches. The time periods for seasonal closures should be the same. Based on your own study, the least significant impact on bird and turtle nesting success is human impact, yet all recommendations only address this issue. Non-endangered birds should not be provided the same buffers and protection as endangered birds. In evaluating breeding success, the bird populations on the dredge spoil islands should also be considered. Please do not make the beach access restrictions any longer or wider than the current May 15 to September 15 restrictions, and preferably shorter.

Correspondence ID: 13661 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 11:12:39

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In the DEIS a study was made concerning how jobs would be effected by imposing the different alternatives. I will be focusing on Alternative A and F as these appear to be both the most favored by two different groups but also the most extreme. For history purposes I will also be referring to the plan for the Edwin B. Forsythe Wildlife Refuge, in particular the Holgate section that was put into effect in late 2000. Cape Hatteras is one of the unique parks in that there are four towns that act as the gateways to the park. By gateways I refer to the ability of each town to offer housing, guiding, support structure of convinces such as gas, food, and other amenities for the enjoyment of the visitors. Each of these Gateways towns' incomes is based on the tourist trade. In turn the people that fill the needed job market rely on other businesses that provide service to them (i.e. Building and repair to housing,

Repair of their vehicles, food shopping, and clothes).

In referring to your own studies under Plan "A" (p574) at the extreme worse, only 135 jobs would be lost causing long term minimal effect. Under Plan "F", 400 jobs (p.594) will be lost. Neither mentions how this will have the "ripple effect" to the local economy for those that live from paycheck to pay check. All of the studies are put into a model that predicts out comes, but not real life. Just as an example, with the statistics being drawn from the 2000 census (http://mcdc2.missouri.edu/websas/dp_products_overview.shtml) there was a working population of 2241 working and a total of 3371 capable of working; this gives 66% of this population working. Now if we go under Plan "A", 62% would remain working or 94% of the original population, under Plan "F", 55% would remain working or 83% of the original population. The difference in the un-employed is 6% under Plan "A" and 17% under Plan "F". This is a difference of 11% would have a big ripple effect to the both the local and regional economy.

Now speaking from my own experience where I was out of work for close to two years in the mid 90's, I still have not fully recovered after 15 years as I had to 1) dip into my savings to make ends meet which included my retirement fund. 2) My salary income has been greatly suffered because I had to take a lower paying job resulting in a loss of seven years of income that also affected both my savings and spending ability. This again affected local business that I patronize. Though this is only the "ripple effect" of one person, multiply this by 400 jobs and families. If the families decide to stay in the area hoping for the promised turn around, there is a burden put on the local governments that must help to supply support for them, lost tax revenue and an increase of government costs for the other support activities such as trash pick-up, schools, medical facilities, and Municipal costs. One has to remember that most of the work in the gateway towns is small businesses which are the backbone of this area. By your own model studies under Alternative "F" would experience "Negligible to moderate adverse impacts". (p.595). However, this is based upon the improvements and projects for accessibility to the public over a short period of time. The history of the park system has been to slowly respond where improvements are concerned and 11% difference to me would have a major effect in the region. Now let us go to the plan as it was put into effect at the Holgate section of the Edwin B. Forsythe Wild Life Refuge. In this section the island of Long Beach island services as the gateway with the small town of Long Beach Township, which includes Holgate and Beach Haven Heights being closest to the referenced beach. Under that study it was stated that just on the beach permits alone a loss of income may result, but this was never followed up. Also over the five year period where the businesses that relied on tourist income alone, four businesses failed because they relied on the extra income that the fishermen provided in both the off season that had limited access, and during the summer months when the beach was closed to all access. During this five year time period, none of the added anticipated jobs materialized such as the Boat Ferrying system that was expected to contribute to provide other support jobs for this service. This may be considered small, but the businesses that failed were small family owned, which were the main incomes for those families. These families if they stayed in the area would still be struggling because the predicted jobs never materialized. Tax revenue was lost to both state and local governments.

For this reason, Alternative "A" is the preferred plan. This plan would allow for the greatest flexibility as long as the maximum funding is provided and common sense is used.

Correspondence ID: 13662 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Quidley-Canning, Leann
Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: To whom it may concern:

I am an original native to Hatteras Island with family dating back long before lightkeepers. I have been managing my family restaurant for 13 years, while this business has been going for 35 years. I could give you several reasons to keep beaches open for my own personal pleasure, as well as my 3 young children, my true concern lies on behalf of my business. I am NOT against the safety for animals, nor do I feel there are any animals any more important than the next, but the amount of space being allotted for the nesting is completely over the extreme. The only ones suffering from these actions are the humans living here and visiting our island. You have proven statistics to what has 'harmed' these nesting areas and it is not anything from human form. Our business is more than seasonal, we are open 90 percent of the year. Much of our business comes from local, but a vast majority relies upon visitors. When these closures began, I noticed a significant decline in our revenue. Many people only looked at headlines and simply cancelled their vacations. Could you blame them, try keeping a family possibly with kids cooped up inside. How much fun is that? Please look at this from our eyes: There is not a single business that will not be affected by the closures. Motels, rental agencies, grocery stores, convenient stores, tackle shops, marinas, charter boats, seafood stores, and my main concern: RESTAURANTS! With our country already in desperate concern for money, what do you think this will do? I already stated that I am not against animal safety, I must provide for my children, nothing comes free. I do not have a government job with benefits, retirement or any insurance, nor do I receive any government help. Aside from the need to supply for my family, I also have my employees relying on income for their families and the cycle could go on and on! Dare County provides the highest income for our state, as I know your job does not rely on our income, but the taxes we pay in inadvertently filter down to your pay. Lets be logistic and come together on this. There has to be a "Happy Medium." Aside from my restaurant, my husband has a charter boat, and while his business may not rely on "beach goers" many of his customers are here with their families on vacation and spend majority of their time on the beach, making memories, this will affect generation after generation. This past Saturday, May 1st, a family was out on a boat together, 6 people, coming through the inlet, the boat capsized, throwing all members out. This occurred at 12 noon. The boat sank, children in life jackets drifted for 4 hours. One man died, a honest life was lost, a man and his childre watched their father/grandfather die. Now, had there been people allowed on the beach to witness this occurrence, someone could have called for help. But these parts of the beachers were closed FOR A BRID? Was that worth a man's life? For his son and grandchildren to witness? Luckily a passing boat spotted the tip of the sunken vessel and immediately boats began searching for the other 5 survivors. It is documented, another 30 minutes and they would have died as well. In closing, I was born and raised here and have solid, great memories of growing up on Hatteras Island. I have been raised in my families business and I desire to raise my children the same way. I want my kids to know their heritage, but to do so, I have got to be able to make a living I have to provide for myself and my children. We are not living in the days where one income can supply all of a families needs, regardless of the career, neither mine nor my husbands work will be able to go on if the beach closure continues. We have an amazing heritage here on Hatteras Island, God blessed us with abilities to earn a living, raise our families, and to keep an island "afloat." I've thanked GOD daily for all he has provided for me, please don't end our heritage or our childrens, we are not trying to "get rich" but simply "earn a living" Thank you for your time, may God Bless You and your coworkers. Sincerely,
 Le Ann Quidley-Canning

Correspondence ID: 13663 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Harvey, Bill
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Sir,

I am against closing the inlets to fishing by rec. fishermen. Net should be 3 miles offshore.
 I have enjoyed fishing all of the outer banks since 1946. (That's a lot of money spent) Good fishermen are also good conservationists. We put all the fish back except what are eat and pick up others trash on the beach and ramps. Please keep keep the Park Service away from the lazy, no good politicians in DC Best Regards, Bill Harvey

Correspondence ID: 13664 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 11:18:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We have been frequent visitors to the Outer Banks for over 40 years. We would like to see better management of beach driving. I would like to see very limited driving on the beaches. I read that the limits put in place for the last several years has helped the bird and turtle population and feel that at the very least, we should stick with a plan such as that. I feel that Americans are becoming very lazy and feel that they cannot walk a few hundred feet.

When I see all the vehicles lined up on the beaches in parking rows, it sickens me. When I see truck tire treads all over the beaches, it sickens me. We fear leaving anything on the beach for fear of it being run over. I even fear lying on the beach for fear of being run over. Fisherman can walk if they want to fish. We do not need to bring our whole "house" with us to the beach. And I really fear approaching the beach access as the trucks are flying to get up the hill and one day a child will be run over at those accesses. The birds are entitled to a beach free of trucks, as are the turtles. As a woman, one has to take some precautions walking alone on the beach. If you see no one and start a long walk, it is very easy for a truck to come flying down the beach, which is bit unnerving. Please limit the driving.

Correspondence ID:	13665	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Wilson, Jim					
Received:	May,05,2010 00:00:00					
Correspondence Type:	Letter					
Correspondence:	I agree, there must be a compromise, the beach can be used by all of us. Binds, turtle, and people. We just have to use common sense. Opp #F is not the right way to go. Jim Wilson					
Correspondence ID:	13666	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,11,2010 11:22:07					
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:	13667	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,11,2010 11:22:07					
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:	13668	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,11,2010 11:22:17					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access. This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. Bird watching and wildlife viewing are big business for any local community. I live in Colorado but someday want to make a trip to Cape Hatteras for birding. I hope the birds are still there!					

Correspondence ID: 13669 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Levins, Karen L
Received: May,11,2010 11:26:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please don't let trashy lazy people destroy yet another beach.

Correspondence ID: 13670 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My DEIS Comments for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area

The enabling legislation created "The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area" for all to enjoy (beachcombers, sunbathers, surfers, horseback riders, anglers, hikers, joggers, wildlife observers, kayakers, swimmers, families, children, grandparents?). The park was never intended to be "The Cape Hatteras Special Interest Group Area for National Audubon Members Only!"

The legislation states: "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area." The enabling legislation created the park as a Recreation Area not a Wildlife Refuge. Areas such as Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island were created to provide habitat and protection for endangered and threatened species. Finding a way to guarantee unrestricted public beach access for pedestrians and ORV that coexists with wildlife needs to be the highest priority. I believe ORV & pedestrian corridors should be maintained with adequate monitoring through temporary resource closures to provide access to the beach. Because of the distances involved, ORV access corridors are required so citizens can travel to their desired destinations within the Recreation Area. ORVs have historically served as the primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Recreation Area, and continue to be the most practical means of access for most visitors to Hatteras Island. To limit ORV access would discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with children, senior citizens and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment such as Fishing, surfing, birding, swimming and family gatherings. Equipment needed for recreating in popular areas of the park cannot be easily carried on foot through miles of deep sand on a hot summer day by even the fittest individual without the risk of heat stroke, dehydration, physical exhaustion or even death. For example: Water, Food, Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing poles, tackle boxes, water-sports boards, first aid kit, cameras, binoculars, etc... ORVs in remote areas of the beach provide shelter from lighting, a place to get out of the heat and emergency transportation for an ill/injured child or elder. ORVs have been used on the Hatteras Island beaches for decades without any resource conflict. It is imperative that ORV use be recognized for exactly what it is: A historical means of access to an area for recreational opportunities. The use of an ORV is not considered a recreational activity in this Recreational Area. ATVs are not permitted. These recreational opportunities sought, allow the public to enjoy the Seashore's resources and values. Denying access to recreational opportunities, many of which are specifically protected in the Enabling Legislation, denies the Seashore's current visitors the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources and values and denies future generations the opportunity to enjoy the park's resources in direct violation of Park Services Management Policies. There is no evidence that ORV beach access causes any unacceptable environmental impacts in the park. Often, traces of ORV access are erased by wind and tide in a matter of hours.

The beaches within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area offer high recreational value to the public. While all of the beaches are suited and commonly used for swimming, sunbathing, wading, shelling and fishing, some beaches are uniquely more favorable for some specific activities. These specific areas should have minimal and flexible buffers for birds and turtles because ORV Closure is the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival. Humans and ORVs can coexist in harmony with birds and turtles. Scientific studies prove that human and ORV presence have an insignificant impact on nesting. Predators, Tides and Storms account for nearly all the lost nest in CHNSRA. Human presence benefits birds and turtles because Human presence decreases predator presence and increases nest survival rates. Prime historical recreation areas that require guaranteed public ORV access under the plan must include: Buxton to Cape Point ? World Famous Surf Fishing on Cape Point ? Prime water sports ? Favorite gathering area for locals and visiting families ? Prime Birding area ? Prime shelling area Cape Point to the Frisco Village line (South Beach) ? Prime child-safe swimming area south of Cape Point to Frisco village ? Favorite gathering area for "locals" and visiting families ? Prime shelling area ? Prime horseback riding area ? Recreational and commercial cast-netting at Cape Point ? Sunbathing ? Water sports ? Snorkeling ? Birding Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Prime fishing area from ramp 55 around Hatteras Inlet spit ? Ramp 55 to/including Hatteras Spit (Hatteras Inlet) ? Recreational and Commercial cast-netting ? Prime family gathering area for visitors in the Hatteras Village area ? Water sports ? Birding Turtle Nests should be relocated from ORV corridors in these prime historical recreation areas. South Beach is an unproductive Plover nesting area so access should be open year round to South Beach. I support resource protection for shorebirds and sea turtles based on peer reviewed science. Who better to advocate preservation of area wildlife than the people whose lives and futures are intertwined to the success of each species?

I agree with these Shorebird / Water bird Buffers: Species Breeding Behavior/ Nest Buffer ORV Pass-through Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 m 30 m 200 m American Oystercatcher Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Flush + 15m Least Terns 30 m 30 m 30 m Other Species CWB 30 m 30 m 30 m MAXIMUM Piping Plover Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 200 meter buffer / Closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to PIPL chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, water or other obstacles. Morning access to the points and spits may be delayed until chicks have been located if the access corridor passes between the waterline and through the buffer area that would otherwise be closed. Reopen access corridor outside of pre-nesting area after chicks fledge. Remove pre-nesting closure 2 weeks after all chicks in the area have fledged.

Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

*** As part of the NEPA process, I Formally Request the National Park Service to provide peer-reviewed science that justifies a 1,000 meter closure in all directions.

MAXIMUM American Oystercatcher Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the unfledged chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffers/closures will be removed after AMOY chicks have fledged (observed flight of 30 meters).

MAXIMUM Colonial Water birds Unfledged Chick Buffers Establish a 30 meter buffer/closure around the chick(s) location. Adjust buffer as needed when chicks are mobile. Monitor daily. Establish ORV/Pedestrian access corridors. Buffer/closure will be removed after all chicks have fledged.

I believe the Four-wheel drive vehicles allowed to drive on the Recreational Area beaches should be registered, licensed, and insured and comply with inspection regulations within the state, country or province where the vehicle is registered. All-Terrain Vehicles (ATVs) should be prohibited. ATVs are defined as a type of off highway vehicle that travels on three or more low-pressure tires; has handle-bar steering; and has a seat designed to be straddled by the operator.

The science offered to support the environmentalist positions does not justify the extreme ORV and pedestrian access restrictions proposed in the DEIS. I believe ORV access to Cape Point, South Beach and Hatteras Inlet should not be restricted.

The proposed 1,000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions for a piping plover unfledged chick brood is extreme and scientifically unjustified. This equals approximately 771 acres per brood. The plover closure should be reduced to 200 meters.

The Oystercatcher is not a federally threatened species and the proposed 300 meter pedestrian/ORV closure is extremely excessive. The Oystercatcher closure should be reduced to 15 meters.

In my opinion, there is no scientific justification to deny human entry into large areas of the recreation area and severely restricting the public's access to all portions of the beach.

I urge you to preserve our beaches, protect natural resources with common sense policies, but not prohibit ORV use and pedestrian access to any portion of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area at any time. Remember, the National Seashore Recreation Area was established for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of this country. How can future generations enjoy the area if access is severely restricted? CORRIDORS are vital in

providing access while managing resources. MANAGEMENT BUFFERS must be based on peer-reviewed science. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should NOT have the same protection as if endangered. TURTLE MANAGEMENT would benefit from nest relocation and other practices. So, please save the communities of Hatteras Island and preserve the historic & cultural way of life of the people on this island for future generations to experience. There are many miles of unpopulated barrier islands on the east coast that are better suited to enhance shorebirds and turtles than Hatteras Island.
Thank You

Correspondence ID:	13671	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Presley, Jacob B						
Received:	May,11,2010 11:27:19						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I am a frequent visitor to the CHNS and visit for the sole purpose of being able to enjoy the seashore through ORV use. I believe that public parks are meant to be used for the enjoyment of the public. I support both pedestrian access and ORV access to all of the beaches. I support the residents of the towns and villages adjacent to the seashore. I am considered a "visitor" and in no way should my input outweigh the opinions and beliefs of the residents. I respect the parks wildlife and believe that before 2007 and now the NPS has done a great job in protecting it. If I have to choose one of the alternatives to support I would choose Alternative A out of the A - F Alternatives. Although I believe that many of the previously used buffers were far to large. Thanks for your time! Respectfully, Jacob Presley						
Correspondence ID:	13672	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 11:28:04						
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:	13673	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Patrizzi, Barry J						
Received:	May,11,2010 11:29:38						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I am writing you today to make formal comments on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement, specifically Alternative F, created by the National Park Service. Myself and my family have been vacationing in Avon on Hatteras Island for years now. We fell in love with the Outer Banks mainly because of the ability to enjoy the ORV access to the beautiful beaches for fishing, wildlife observation and having our two dogs with us. These are all things we cannot enjoy in New Jersey where we live and can be at the beach in less than a one hour drive. In New Jersey, we can operate an ORV in very limited areas and can only have pets on the beach during certain months. We must also buy a permit to access the beach and a beach tag to sit on an overcrowded beach where you aren't allowed to do much of anything. What you have in the Outer Banks National Seashore is truly a special privilege that was meant to be enjoyed by all. For this to be taken away or severely limited would be a tragedy for all of us. I would also like to call attention to the potential economic impact of Alternative F. The DEIS suggests "F" will have low impact on small businesses. From my experiences with small business owners on Hatteras Island, any restriction in beach access will have severe economic impacts to their income as the closures in the past years have. In an already poor economy, the limiting of beach access has proved devastating to all businesses and residents on Hatteras Island. I personally have cut my vacationing at the Outer banks down from two trips a year (one in May and one in October) down to one trip in October because of the extremely limited beach access during the summer months. I am urging you to formulate a management plan with flexibility. Without the ability to change user patterns while keeping access open, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area will become but a memory to generations of users. Sincerely, Barry Patrizzi Cherry Hill, NJ						
Correspondence ID:	13674	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 11:32:19						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please keep the Cape Hatteras beaches open for the public. Parks are for people to enjoy as well as for preservation. A national park needs to be "managed", not "closed". I visit the outer banks area several times a year and have family members who own property there. The feeling of open spaces and wild beaches is the biggest draw to the area. Please allow this popular fishing and recreation area to remain open for all to enjoy.						
Correspondence ID:	13675	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 11:36:05						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	These beaches need to have open access so that all can enjoy them. Not every beach has to be overcommercialized or access restricted. The public has right to be able to use this resource in what ever way they decide, if that means going for a walk or for drive to access their favorite spot on the beach away from every one else. I took my family out to the Outer Banks,NC last summer and enjoyed the unspoiled and unrestricted freedom we had while we were there. We have already made reservations to go back this year. One of the major reasons is because we are able to drive down the beach and						

find our own spot. Thanks for keeping our beaches open and accessible for ALL to use.

Correspondence ID: 13676 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Salman, Steven F
Received: May,11,2010 11:36:19
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: 13677 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Michael, Gary
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Mr. Murray,
 I sit here reading the DEIS document and wondering where it will all end. The total closure of the Seashore Park to all humans? The restrictions and closures as they stand with this document will put an end to the economy of the Outer Banks. If no economy-no visitors-thus no need for the Park Service to be here-just make it a desert island. I have been coming out here for over 50 years to visit and fish. I have seen people of all races, colors, creeds, and sizes enjoying nature at its finest. The fishermen I have seen over the years hav eALWAYS taken the extra time and effort to look after birds in distress or calling in problems or turtle situations. When I have personally called in teenagers on the beach "feeling their aots" I was told there is nothing the Park Service can do, but all the sudden, there is a push to close all the beaches to ORV use to great spots to recreate. It seems strange that the raccoons, foxes, etc. don't stand a chance as they are being trapped just because they live here. Is the government out to trap humans for just being out here enjoyin glife? A few people (bad apples) seemed to have screwed things up for everyone. If someone speeds on the beach is everyone else being penalized for just being there? I feel sure there can be an answer to the situation of ORV use on the beach. Please heed our request before big government does something that comes back to "bite us all in the butt."
 Sincerely,
 Gary M Michael

Correspondence ID: 13678 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: McFarlane, Lisa G
Received: May,11,2010 11:37:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been driving on the Outer Banks Sand for 30+ years. I am respectful of all animals, dunes, trash pickup and I know all of my friends have been this way for the same period of time. Blocking off areas for the migratory birds is fine, but once they have birthed their young and the park service opens the beaches back up, everything is fine. Permanently closing over 60% of the beaches is just not fair to those of us who plan their vacations around the 4WD experience, who have bought property down in the Outer Banks for that purpose. You can't cram in all of the 4WDers into such a small area without unintentional destruction of the shores. The way it is now is protective enough to the wildlife and the sand.

Correspondence ID: 13679 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: HARRELL, BOBBY F
Received: May,11,2010 11:40:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
 re: "historical use" and access to OUR beaches
 Dear Mr. Murray,
 As a local citizen, property owner, business owner and tax payer, I am very concerned about the impact to our area, as a result of the proposed and ongoing restrictions to access OUR beaches.
 Businesses, particularly on Ocracoke and Hatteras Island, have already suffered considerably from the closures. Coupled with the current economic situation, further closures could easily put more small businesses out of business. Our area has been built on the small, private business operators. People who have invested and leveraged everthing to survive, and now are now seeing their businesses struggle and fail due to closures, when their families where gaurenteed access to those beaches.
 Is there any provision to compensate the business and property owners for loss of revenue? My rental cottage in Ocracoke has not rented as well for the last two years, due to the beach closures.
 I have even stopped going down to Ocracoke as much myself, in the off season, due to the inability to fish on the south point, at sunrise and at night, where I have fished for 30 years. I am only one person, but when I am in Ocracoke, I will average spending \$100./day on food, tackle, gas, etc., not even counting lodging, since we have a home there. Multiple that by the many visitors who decide not to visit Ocracoke or Hatteras Island, and the economic impact is considerable for the small businesses.
 I just don't understand why access corridors can not be used to access the points of Oregon Inlet, Hatteras, and Ocracoke Inlets. Enough width for vehicles to drive and park one deep, would be adequate.
 How about the handicap visitors? Beach closures limit how these people can enjoy OUR beaches. My mother-in-law, a Hatteras native, suffered from alzheimers, but she loved to ride down on the beach and sit with the wind and surf in her face. If she were still here, she would be furious that the "historical access" that was gaurenteed to her father had been denied the "natives" of Hatteras Island. And by limiting access for the visitors, the local people are being denied the opportunity to support their families.
 80+% of Dare County is preserved or protected. There is only 6.5% the land that is suitable for building and private usage. Further restriction seems

totally unfair the people, both visitors and local.

Ocracoke is responsible for over 50% of Hyde County's revenue. Hyde County is one of the poorest counties in North Carolina. Further restrictions can have a severe economic impact on the whole county; schools, health services, etc.

Please, let common sense and practical application enter in to all decisions to close OUR beaches. That's right, the beaches are OUR beaches, bought and paid for by the tax payers/users of the resource.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Bobby Harrell

Correspondence ID:	13680	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Hayes, Butch					
Received:	May,11,2010 11:41:07					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	We've been coming to the beach for the last 40 years and have been responsible 4-wheelers.Sharing the beach with the turtles and other wildlife.The beach is a valuable asset we would like to continue to use as American citizens.					
Correspondence ID:	13681	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Esposito, Robert					
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00					
Correspondence Type:	Web Form					
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Respectfully, Robert Esposito 7923 Hope Valley Court Adamstown, MD 21710					
Correspondence ID:	13682	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,11,2010 11:43:29					
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:	13683	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private: Y
Name:	private					
Received:	May,11,2010 11:44:17					
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:	13684	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	
Name:	Diemer, Donald J					

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
 Dear Superintendent Murray,
 Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
 I have, however, reviewed the Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process. It succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources, the proper balance of which is absolutely necessary.
 Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
 Sincerely,
 Donald Joseph Diemer, Jr. Mary Catherine Diemer 10819 Warfield Place Columbia, MD 21044
 email: joediemer@comcast.net

Correspondence ID: 13685 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 11:46:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I just read the letter from John and Sharon Newbold that was published in today's Coastland Times. I wholeheartedly agree with every point they made, and I think the Off-Road Management plan that has been proposed is flawed. I love birds, and I think they need to be protected, to a point. I think this plan completely disregards the economic impact that beach closures have on residents and visitors.

Correspondence ID: 13686 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, Eduardo
Received: May,11,2010 11:46:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Another example of government/environmental groups gone wild. Fabricate a crisis, create new rules as a solution, go thru fake public input phase, adopt new rules. End result: more control over us common folk by the government. Understand, without rules the government has no power. . . . Law abiding, tax paying citizens be damned. We are, in essence, subsidizing this coup by the federal government via payment of taxes to further restrict public access to public property.
 Access to America's beaches is being threatened by misguided environmental groups who want to prohibit, or severely restrict, the right of people to continue the responsible use of this environment.
 I strongly oppose the latest plan to severely limit and restrict beach access at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

Correspondence ID: 13687 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 11:47:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: AS A PROPERTY OWNER ON HATTERAS ISLAND THE NEW PLAN BEING CONSIDERED WILL HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON US. STUDIES HAVE SHOWN IF THESE RULES ARE IMPLEMENTED, TOURISM WILL BE GREATLY IMPACTED. MOST PEOPLE COME TO THE BEACH TO GO TO THE BEACH. IF YOU KEEP THEM FROM THE BEACH THEY WON'T COME AND OUR RENTAL HOUSES WILL LOOSE MONEY. WE RELY ON THE INCOME FROM OUR RENTALS TO PAY 75% OF THE COST AND WITH THE ECONOMIC SITUATION AS IT IS, WE ARE JUST KEEPING UP WITH PAYMENTS. IF WE LOSE RENTAL INCOME WE WILL HAVE TO SELL OUR HOUSES, IT'S AS SIMPLE AS THAT. BELOW ARE MY COMMENTS.
 1) PAGE 201: WE DISAGREE WITH THE NPS STATEMENT: ? EVEN WITH RESOURCE CLOSURES IN PLACE, PROTECTED SPECIES ARE STILL AT RISK(FROM PEDESTRIANS AND ORVs)?
 2) WE AGREE WITH YOUR STATEMENT? ORVs HAVE LONG SERVED AS A PRIMARY FORM OF ACCESS FOR MANY PORTIONS OF THE BEACH IN THE SEASHORE, AND CONTINUE TO BE MOST PRACTIAL MEANS OF ACCESS AND PARKING FOR MANY VISITORS?
 3) PAGE 121 ? 127. I STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH THE BUFFERS AS PRESENTED. WE MUST ALLOW FOR PASSTHRU CORRIDORS. THE BEACH IS LINEAR WITH THE OCEAN BUFFERING ON ONE SIDE AND THE DUNE LINE ON THE THE OTHER. FOR EXAMPLE IF YOU PINCH OFF ACCESS ON ONE SIDE OF A 4 MILE LINEAR BEACH AND PINCH OFF ACCESS ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE 4 MILE SECTION OF BECAH WITH NO CORRIDOR, THEN YOU EFFECTIVELY HAVE CLOSED OFF ALL 4 MILES OF THE BEACH BECAUSE YOU CAN'T GET THERE. THE PROPOSED BIRD BUFFERS ARE TOO LARGE, BLOCKING ACCESS TO THE INTERIOR SECTIONS FROM THE TWO BUFFERED ENDS.
 NON ENDANGERED BIRDS SHOULD NOT HAVE THE SAME PROTECTION AS IF ENDANGERED. NOT ALLOWING ORV ACCESS IS PARAMOUNT TO DENYING THE PUBLIC ACCESS TO THESE BEACHES.
 4) PAGES 97-101 I STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH PROPOSALS IN THIS SECTION SAYING ORVs WILL BE PROHIBITED YEAR ROUND BETWEEN RAMPS 27 AND 30, AT HATTERAS INLET (HATTERAS SPIT) OCRACOKE INLET (NORTH OCRACOKE SPIT) AND VARIOUS LOCATIONS.
 NOT ALLOWING ORV ACCESS IS PARAMOUNT TO DENYING THE PUBLIC ACCESSTO THESE BEACHES. THEY ARE LOCATED MILES FROM THE NEAREST PARKING OR PAVED ROAD AREA AND TOO FAR TO ACCESS ON FOOT. AS A MATTER OF COURSE, THERE HAS BEEN NO BREEDING OF PIPING PLOVER OR OTHER ENDANGERED SPECIES AT THE HATTERAS ISLAND INLET (SPIT) AREA IN THE PAST 6 YEARS.
 DAVID AND AMY HILD

Correspondence ID: 13688 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 11:48:41
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: 13689 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have, however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Pat Laws PO Box 292 Hatteras, NC 27943

Correspondence ID: 13690 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Davis, Trisha L
Received: May,11,2010 11:51:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Supt. Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Supt. Murray:
As a new Ocracoke home owner, I would like to comment on the ORV DEIS which is under consideration. I am not pleased with any of the six alternatives presented, each for a different reason.
However, I believe that the Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement represents many community constituents and provides an excellent recommendation on ways to protect the seashore environments while not diminishing any opportunities for tourists to enjoy our beaches.
I am counting on your considering all the comments you have received, and the sincere commitments of all the residents that care so deeply about these issues.
Sincerely,
Trisha L. Davis 79 Lighthouse Rd Ocracoke, NC 27960

Correspondence ID: 13691 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 11:52:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should be the basis for the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13692 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the 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,
Natural environments and wildlife are so important for everyone. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13693 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 11:52:19
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: 13694 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 11:52:19
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: 13695 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 11:52:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
I feel as an avid park supporter and outdoors person that Cape Hatteras falls short in promoting the visitor experience. While CAHA offers camping for it visitors is it not family friendly, unless you own an ORV. I would love nothing more than to bring my daughter camping and enjoy the beach. While there are board walks and foot trails leading from the campgrounds to the beaches, they all lead to ORV beaches. These beaches are full of tire ruts and vehicles and offer no aesthetic value or safety for pedestrians and most certainly not for those with small children. How can you have a seashore with

campgrounds with no access to vehicle free beaches for families to enjoy? After all isn't that what people are looking for when planning a family vacation? I understand that CAHA provides some vehicle free beaches which are mainly centered around the village areas. While these beaches may provide access to those people who are staying in the village, they do not offer the park visitor anything. Even with the addition of parking lots and foot paths - the true park visitor patronizing the Park run campgrounds - would have to pack up their vehicle and family to search for parking space and battle the droves of people renting vacation cottages. People flock to the our National Parks to enjoy the scenery and solitude they provide. It's an opportunity to sink into another realm, to learn, to relax and enjoy. This valuable opportunity is lost at CAHA. I've spent many hours and many years enjoying what CAHA has to offer and I am sad to say that I don't see myself bringing my family there anytime soon. The wonderment that I so fondly remember has been destroyed by one user group - the ORV's. I ask that you rethink the visitor experience and provide access to vehicle free beaches for those paying for campsites in order to enjoy your park. Their happiness and safety should be part of your top priorities along with habitat and species protection.

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

Correspondence ID: 13696 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: michaels, stephan i
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Stephan Michaels

Correspondence ID: 13697 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gould, Burnham
Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Mr. Murray:
May 3, 2010
Regarding the six alternatives described in the DEIS for the CHNS draft Off Road Vehicle Management Plan, please record my wife and me as favoring Alternative D. Unfortunately, none of the alternatives described adequately protect wilderness areas. There needs to be firm, clear, unambiguous prohibitions about driving on beaches in national parks and seashores. More and wider beaches must be set aside for pedestrian access only, with appropriate restrictions to protect wildlife needs during breeding seasons. Continued vehicle access to some of the most environmentally sensitive areas, such as Cape Point, South Beach, the Hatteras Spit, and South Point, is particularly disturbing. Our best hope is that the Park Service will reconsider its position and adopt something very close to Alternative D. If that should fail, we must hope that our federal legislative and legal systems will provide better direction within the next few years. Thank you for your consideration. Yours truly, Burnham S. Gould, Jr

Correspondence ID: 13698 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Nick and Margaret Stevens 57390 Lighthouse rd Hatteras,NC, 27943

Correspondence ID: 13699 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Russick, Sharon
Received: May,11,2010 11:55:24
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray, Don't let Off Road Vehicles dominate Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The plan on the verge of approval will disproportionately dedicate beach use to year-round ORV traffic at the expense of wildlife and pedestrian visitors. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting wildlife must take precedence over ORV use.

Correspondence ID: 13700 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lowe, Victoria
Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: To whom it may concern, I am in complete agreement that the endangered species of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area should be protected but I believe that they should be protected in such a way that is not detrimental to the economy and businesses of Hatteras Island. As both a visitor and relocater to the Island I understand how reliant the business owners of the island are to visitors and tourists. If access is completely shut down in areas such as Cape Point and South Point as suggested on p468 of the DEIS Assessment, fewer and fewer visitors will visit and businesses will suffer. I believe these closures to be overly restrictive and access could be maintained for ORV's and pedestrians within reasonable guidelines while the nesting and breeding birds continue to remain protected. Yours sincerely
Victoria Lowe President Paw Design Studio

Correspondence ID: 13701 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area

1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954

Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.

I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.

Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13702 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 11:57:44

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please accept this letter as my comments on the DEIS at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. After reviewing the DEIS, I would like to strongly urge NPS to adopt a "reasonable and logical" approach to ORV use inside the park. Based on several of the Alternatives in the DEIS, reason and logic are not being employed. I am not submitting my comments frivolously. I take conservation of our natural resources very seriously. There has to be a way to allow reason and logic to enter the process of allowing ORV's in the park. To wit, I submit the following:

- The use of a 1,000 meter buffer for each nest is illogical. I offer that a person can be significantly closer to the President of the United States while he is sitting in the Oval Office than a person can be to a nest of birds at CHNS. A reasonable alternative would be to have significantly smaller buffers such as 200 meters that allow for ample room for the chicks to fledge and would still allow for public access to the beaches. - Why is it not reasonable to count the birds that nest on Cora June Island? The birds that nest there are in most cases the same birds the Consent Decree was designed to protect yet the environmentalists and the NPS refuse to publicly acknowledge their existence. I understand that technically the island lies outside the NPS jurisdiction however, a reasonable and prudent person can see the fact that this island is teeming with birds. A reasonable and prudent person, once they include the birds on Cora June Island, would see that the bird population in Hatteras is actually healthy. - There has not been a true economic impact study of the effect of the Consent Decree and beach closures that uses known, proven and logical methods. The Outer Banks economy is based on tourism, particularly on the ability to access and use the beaches. Not having the ability to access the beaches will deter and detract from tourism. How could it not? At the same time, the DEIS does not properly acknowledge the historical and cultural significance the use of the beaches and its resources has to the communities in CHNS. The residents and their families have used the beaches responsibly for generations and have developed a way of life unique to the Outer Banks. That culture and history must be preserved. - I object to the eradication of predators within CHNS in the name of saving a small number of birds. Having the power to alter with Mother Nature and natural selection is a slippery slope that the NPS has no business getting involved with. - With the possibility of access to the beaches limited to walking, handicapped and elderly people would be completely shut off from access to the beaches. How is it reasonable and logical to deny anyone the right to enjoy public lands? - Why can't the vegetation within the park be managed more responsibly to allow for potential nesting further away from the beach but still within the park grounds? This can be accomplished by NPS not allowing sections of the park to be overgrown.

I appreciate the opportunity to offer my comments to NPS. I would appreciate the same courtesy of reviewing my comments along with all of the other comments that I know are being submitted. My objective with this is to again, ensure that NPS takes reason and logic into account when determining the final plan for ORV usage. As a responsible driver of the beaches in CHNS, I exercise caution every time I have the opportunity to drive on the beaches. Numerous other drivers do as well. I offer that there has never been a documented case of a beach user deliberately destroying a nest. That said, no one can ensure that it will never happen in the future. We can hope that through a combination of education regarding responsible use of driving on the beaches and proper conservation techniques, future generations can enjoy one of the great natural wonders that is CHNS.

Respectfully submitted, Jim McGettigan Lansdale, PA

Correspondence ID: 13703 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954

Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.

I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.

Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Lauren and John LeReche from Herndon VA We are so upset when we see so many "Keep off this" and "keep off that" signs at the beloved cherished and well taken care of beaches of the Outer Banks...specifically...Hatteras, Frisco and Buxton. The signs are very unfriendly and stand out like ugly billboards and political advertising. Please help us by stopping these people from raping our beaches.

Correspondence ID: 13704 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Lowe, Victoria

Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: To whom it may concern, Whilst I completely agree that the natural beauty and endangered species of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area should be protected I disagree with the extremity of the 1000m Buffer system for the piping plovers currently suggested on pages 121-127 of the DEIS Assessment. As an artist and visitor for many years to Hatteras Island I have been drawn by both its natural beauty and the wonderful, accessible recreational opportunities there.

Surely lesser severer distances for the buffers (a endorsed by the coalition) would provide more than adequate protection for the birds and thus also allowing the passage of ORV's and pedestrians in these areas. I believe it is as equally important for those visitors and locals who truly appreciate the island be able to pass through such areas and enjoy the Island to its full potential whilst the birds and other species remain protected. Yours sincerely
Victoria Lowe President Paw Print Design Studio

Correspondence ID: 13705 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Hudson, Mark

Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Dear Mr. Murray, I am totally against the proposed DEIS alternative F because of the following: Regarding ORV usage, it is the most restrictive of the alternatives. From the NPS own reports, restrictive ORV routes not only don't work, they have the opposite effect. In 2009, the number of Piping Plover and Oystercatcher chicks fledged was down from the previous year by 1 and 3 chicks respectively. Although ORV routes in the late spring and summer of 2008 were restricted under the "consent Decree", the spring nesting had already begun. 2009 is the first full year by which comparisons can be made.

0012587

2007 nesting season (without ORV restrictions) was the most successful Plover breeding season in over 20 years. The Coalitions Position statement is a more thorough and scientifically based guideline for managing the Park. Please start over using that document. Regards,
R. Mark Hudson 1117 Lake Valley Drive Wake Forest, NC 27587

Correspondence ID: 13706 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 12:00:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly disagree with the the draft Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management plan and Environmental Impact Statement published in March 2010. My family's non-rental soundfront vacation home in Buxton makes it possible for us to enjoy access to the local beaches. The draft management plan, if put into effect, will make access nearly impossible for us and for many locals and visitors. My husband and I are 67, with arthritis in knees and hips, so we cannot walk a considerable distance to the beach. We could not bring our dog under the proposed plan. We could not bring our grandchildren, both of whom are not quite two years old, because we cannot carry them very far. We could not enjoy playing in the surf, sunning, watching birds, searching for shells, watching young people enjoy water sports, or watching surf fishermen. Furthermore, I disagree with the current indiscriminate trapping of wildlife

Correspondence ID: 13707 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hudson, Mark
Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Regarding DEIS for CHNSRA Dear Mr. Murray,
I'm sorry but I cannot support any of the proposals in the DEIS. We are talking about impacting the lives of thousands of humans, trapping and killing hundreds of animals, all for 6 birds a year. I have lost all faith in my government, even though I voted for our current President. Please reinstate sanity and go back to the drawing board. A good start would be the Coalition's Position statement.
Regards,
R Mark Hudson

Correspondence ID: 13708 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 12:02:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Surf fishing out of the back of my truck along the OBX is a valued tradition I hold dear as a multi generation NC native. Unfortunately, many of the places with the best fishing are not accessible by pedestrians. At the same time I understand the need to protect wildlife. BUT, what some of these environmentalists are asking for is simply over the top. By their standards ALL human use of the areas in question will be terminated (not just ORV use)... except by some of them of course... to monitor their birds and turtles. Why does miles of beach need to be closed down because one nest is found back in the dunes? What ever happened to using a little common sense? A lot of good peoples' lives will be adversely affected all because of a hand full of birds. KEEP THE BEACHES OPEN TO ORV'S!

Correspondence ID: 13709 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: McKenna, Patricia R
Received: May,11,2010 12:02:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To the National Park Service,
I am an Outer Banks resident who uses the Cape Hatteras National Seashore for recreation throughout the year. I especially enjoy kite boarding in the waters off the seashore. I am glad that your officers are there to protect the wildlife and the human visitors.
It seems that all of the options in the DEIS are going to require an incredible amount of park resources to enforce. I think these complicated plans are a terrible waste of taxpayer money. But this is what we have to work with. My comments follow.
I am strongly in favor of driving and walking corridors being preserved through ALL areas of the National Seashore. I think all users of the seashore respect REASONABLE accommodation of wildlife. A plan which includes driving and walking corridors at all times and in all places will help the average person like me figure out how to access areas of the seashore without becoming hopelessly confused.
Please reconsider buffer measurements. I'd like more peer review of the distance necessary for these buffers. They seem to err on the side of being too large.
Birds not considered endangered should not be afforded protection under your plan. I would also like you to consider other turtle management practices that allow for more beach access.
My family had a terrible experience last winter driving on the beach. As it was low tide, we did not see the signs indicating no driving on a part of the beach near Oregon Inlet (I don't think nesting closures were involved in this case). We drove into a restricted area where we were stopped by a NPS officer. We were completely apologetic and admitted fault. We were treated like common criminals by the NPS officer. He made my husband get out of the automobile in front of his children where he was ordered to take his hands out of his pockets, as if he were suspected of having a weapon. The children still talk about how scary the whole experience was.
I am frankly afraid to drive on the beach in the Seashore in case I make a mistake again. Please don't turn this national treasure into a mess of bureaucratic formulae and mean-hearted law enforcement. Please simplify the beach driving plan as much as possible.
Thank you, Patty McKenna 252-255-0530

Correspondence ID: 13710 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hudson, Mark
Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Regarding DEIS for CHNSRA Dear Mr. Murray,
I cannot support the proposed DE IS because of the enormous buffer zones afforded to nesting birds and especially chicks. 1000 meter buffer zones equate to 528 acres of land, which means that in most states a convicted child molester can get closer to an Elementary school full of children than a fisherman can get to plover chick. This bird is not even on the endangered list! 100 meter buffers would be more than adequate.
Regards, R. Mark Hudson 1117 Lake Valley Drive Wake Forest, NC 27587

Correspondence ID: 13711 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 12:03:20
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Hello, I am writing to you to express my feelings on Beach Access on Hatteras Island. I am originally from Delaware and have spent all of my memorable life at the Delaware beaches. Over the past 40 years I have watched the steady methodical closing of access to Beaches due to development

and privatization all along the Delaware coast. Once a year we would travel to the Outer Banks to admire the huge dunes and the 60+ miles of "open" beach. The trip to the Outer Banks represented a destination where we could see the beaches as they were intended. Open for all to enjoy. As you are undoubtedly aware the purpose of our National Parks centers on the credo of access and preservation of those areas so designated for all present and future generations to enjoy. Cape Hatteras National Seashore accomplishes that end in a way that is truly unique in the National Park system. The inclusion of the word "Recreational" in the naming of the park is significant and plainly states, not by inference, that one of the primary purposes of the Park is recreation. Recreation requires access that allows for all to access the beach for the many definitions of the word. My wife and I have purchased property on Hatteras because of the ease of access to the beaches. We also acknowledge and respect the need for preservation of nature and the many forms of wildlife that have made these beaches their homes for ions. We also feel that any restriction beyond that needed to preserve these many forms of wildlife is an infringement on the original purpose which brought about the formation of the park. We feel that the "banging of the drum" by special interest groups will unfairly influence decisions made by the Park Service. This situation requires a careful balance between the need for preservation and the need for access. We do not believe one has priority of importance over the other but the two need to co-exist in a harmony that meets the needs of all.

Thank You

Correspondence ID: 13712 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hudson, Mark
Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Regarding DEIS for CHNSRA Dear Mr. Murray,
The National Park Service has trapped and killed over 300 mammals in 2008 (feral cats, raccoons, mink, opossum, muskrat, otter, gray fox, red fox, nutria) and 464 of the same plus coyotes in 2009. With the exception of nutria, all are native species. All this resulted in 7 fledged piping plovers in 2008 and 6 fledged piping plovers in 2009. That's 58 dead animals for every chick (that are not even classified as endangered). I cannot support and Federal Regulation that continues with these practices. Please discontinue and start the DEIS over. The Coalition's position statement would be a good place to start.
Regards,
Mark Hudson

Correspondence ID: 13713 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Sheriff, Lenny C
Received: May,11,2010 12:05:14
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Superintendent, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area:
It is a real travesty when another SIG (Special Interest Group) can deprive so many hardworking people their rights established by congress. In this case Congress established Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area for the people to enjoy. If the SIGs prevail the beach access will be restricted causing more business and homes to go into foreclosure resulting in less tax revenue for Federal, State and Local government.
Vacationers who visit our little place of peace and relaxation on earth have already had fireworks banned and are now forced to buy a fishing license to cast their line into the ocean in hopes of catching a memory. Now Beach Access restriction and not allowing mans best friend to tag along.
Here is another recent example of a SIG bullying our local leaders. Watching the local government meetings on television. It was an outrage when I saw the leaders in one of our communities forced to stop having a prayer before their meetings. It was decided the community would not be able to spend the taxpayer's money to fight a lawsuit when there are so many other expenses needing attention. I am not a very religious person, but I do believe in the power of prayer. It can help when making the difficult decisions our leaders face.
I do have faith there are still people with good judgment and common sense in this world. It is very difficult to watch as the SIGs suppress them. The SIGs have companies, organizations and people sending them money when the donators do not have all the facts. Please do not let this happen in this case. Allow the vacationers and the fine people who call this area home to continue to enjoy the beaches without restrictions.
Reading different articles on the Piping Plovers it seems the use of "enclosures" is an effective way of notifying people where the birds are nesting and keeping the predators away. If one of the nests are found in a heavy traffic area and it is in emanate danger; move it as in the case of a Hurricane. No need to close the beach and grant the bird so much real estate. Post signs within a reasonable limit of the nests so everyone with binoculars can observe natures beauty if they like. If someone is caught doing intentional harm to any of the wildlife on our beaches they should be prosecuted. The majority of the visitors and residents would never do anything to harm the wild life. Please keep this in perspective when expanding the area after someone runs over a sign. It was probably a vacationer who felt that was his or her way to protest, not knowing the repercussions.
It sure would be interesting to see what our founding fathers, past leaders and Veterans who fought for the people's rights would be thinking about this. The world and our human rights have been going to the birds since 9-11, please do the right thing and don't allow the masses to be bullied by the SIGs. God Bless America! And may you enjoy peaceful walks on her beaches with your best friend or be awestruck by the awesome beauty of the sun rising next to your fishing pole. Stay real and don't allow the SIGs to bully you.

Correspondence ID: 13714 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Thomas and Barbara Yingling 1491 Mission Rd. Lancaster, PA 17601

Correspondence ID: 13715 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

0012589

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Jeffery Shipman 625 Valley Forge Drive Newport News VA 23602

Correspondence ID: 13716 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 12:06:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please allow us to live on our beautiful island and enjoy our beaches. The wildlife is very important to all of us, but so are the wonderful beaches that God gave to us to use. It's difficult to watch others come from far away to pass judgment and instill changes that really don't affect them. Thank you for remembering that "we the people" do love our island and want to protect it.

Correspondence ID: 13717 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 12:06:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly disagree with the the draft Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management plan and Environmental Impact Statement published in March 2010. My family's non-rental soundfront vacation home in Buxton makes it possible for us to enjoy access to the local beaches. The draft management plan, if put into effect, will make access nearly impossible for us and for many locals and visitors. My husband and I are 67, with arthritis in knees and hips, so we cannot walk a considerable distance to the beach. We could not bring our dog under the proposed plan. We could not bring our grandchildren, both of whom are not quite two years old, because we cannot carry them very far. We could not enjoy playing in the surf, sunning, watching birds, searching for shells, watching young people enjoy water sports, or watching surf fishermen. Furthermore, I disagree with the current indiscriminate trapping of wildlife. Some dedicated local people are licensed by the government to rescue and rehabilitate injured birds and mammals, while at the same time the government is using taxpayer dollars to trap and kill other wildlife. Why are the lives of some wildlife worth so little? And why are the are the values of many locals and visitors so unimportant?

Correspondence ID: 13718 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Marley, Lisa
Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: RE: Cape Hatteras National Seashore Offroad Vehicle Management Plan I Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comment I: On Page iii, one of the objectives listed is 'Provide protection for threatened, endangered, and other protected species (e.g., state listed species) and their habitats...'. I do not agree that the DEIS adequately takes into account the non-human factors that account for the majority of species and habitat destruction. For example, with regard to turtles, on page 220, it states, "The majority of turtle nest losses at the Seashore from 1999 to 2007 were weather related, particularly due to hurricanes and other storms. During this time, six hurricanes caused impacts to nests. In 2003, Hurricane Isabel destroyed 52 of the 87 nests (34 had hatched before the storm); there was so much water and sand movement along the beaches that no evidence of any nests could be found afterward. The Seashore also felt the effects of numerous tropical storms and hurricanes as they passed by offshore. The report, on the same page, states that foxes destroyed up to nine nests per year between 1999 and 2008 and that ghost crab predation was reported in up to 26 nests per year. Given the harsh weather and predation conditions on the CHNS, would it not be better to relocate the turtle nests to a more hospitable location as is done when major storms are bearing down? Why is relocation not an alternative? Why do we humans encourage the wildlife to engage in behavior that is destructive to them? Why not encourage them to locate their nests in safer places?
Comment II: Page 266 states that the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge is managed separately and under a different regulatory framework by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Why is land adjacent to the CNHS not considered as part of the same ecosystem as CHNS? The wildlife do not recognize the boundaries. All activity for the wildlife documented in this Study should include the activity in neighboring areas such as PINWR in order to obtain an accurate picture of the activity. It may be that the birds prefer PINWR for certain reasons and it is important that we understand why some birds choose that area over CHNS. It may be a superior nesting ground due to fewer predators, more protection from storms or other factors. Those factors should be studied and taken into account. I believe that these animals have instincts that have been honed over many millennia. If the birds find CHNS inhospitable, they will eventually relocate to more hospitable breeding grounds in order to ensure the survival of their species. And they may be doing just that. It is important that we not look at the CHNS in a vacuum. Those neighboring areas may offer clues as to how these birds have and are adapting to the weather and predators.
Sincerely, Lisa Marley

Correspondence ID: 13719 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Horan, Diane
Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Mike:
I agree that the birds and turtles should be protected, but reasonably so. I feel that our (residents and tourists) corridors of beach access to the ocean side areas of Cape Point and ramp 49, and sound side access from Rodanthe to village of Hatteras also should be protected. I disagree with pages 121-127 of the NPS DEIS because the buffers are too large, and do not allow for corridors of beach access for the humans. Hoping that the people are protected as well as the birds, I remain. Sincerely,
Diane Horan PO Box 933 Buxton, NC 27920

Correspondence ID: 13720 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hudson, Mark
Received: May,04,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: This DEIS boils down to a battle between wanting to protect certain species of birds and sea turtles with the ability to safely drive ORV's on the beach. Alternative F is the most restrictive ORV alternative, which is totally unnecessary. The Piping Plovers that nest at CHNSRA are considered "threatened", not endangered. CHNSRA is on the extreme Southern edge of the Plovers breeding range which accounts for the historically low numbers within the Park. Most Plovers nest well north of the Park, from Virginias' Eastern Shore to Newfoundland, Canada; with the majority of nesting occurring mid-range. They nest in areas that are subject to frequent overwash and frequently lose nests as a result. There are 21 documented ORV related plover deaths in the entire United States. Twenty of these were committed by federal vehicles. In the past 50 years, not one single plover death can be attributed to an ORV user in this Park. Nearly one hundred percent of plover mortality at CHNSRA has been a result of either storms or predation. Mammalian Predation: 54% Storm / Lunar Tides: 29% Nest Abandonment: 6% Avian Predation: 5% Ghost Crab Predation: 3% Human Interference: 3% Statistics from NPS records
Protecting the environment and inhabitants of the Park is important for fishermen also. But the ORV restrictions in Alternative F are so farfetched, they cannot be seen as anything but irrational. In alternative F, a single Plover chick is given 1000 meter buffer zone which equates to 524 acres. As such, in

most American communities, a convicted child molester can live closer to a public school than a fisherman and his family can get to a plover. Alternative F also includes a ban on night driving believing it dis-orients sea turtles. This ignores the facts of Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge, the northern 22 miles of beach on Hatteras Island. At Pea Island NWR, there is no beach driving and less than a dozen lights visible from the sea. Very few pedestrians frequent these beaches due to the difficulty in accessing them. And yet Pea Island has no greater turtle nesting success than ORV accessible beaches but does have more false crawls and aborted nesting attempts, than the open beaches. The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas. Please go back to drawing board with this DEIS, and start with the Coalition's position statement.

Regards,
R. Mark Hudson

Correspondence ID:	13721	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. I consider myself a responsible steward of our environment. But, after review and consideration of the National Park Service DEIS I 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 succeeds in protecting the area's fragile resources while enabling responsible use by human residents and visitors. I believe that is important to protect the environment and threatened species. However, the public's right to this beautiful resource must also be preserved. In fact, preserving the public's right to pursue recreational activities on Cape Hatteras National Seashore is of paramount importance if we are to foster people's love and respect for the natural world. I have lived in a number of coastal communities and traveled extensively to others and I can say without hesitation that Cape Hatteras' beaches are among the most pristine. People appreciate and respect the area's natural beauty and wildlife. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Carol O'Neill						
Correspondence ID:	13722	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thomas and Barbara Yingling 1491 Mission Rd. Lancaster, PA 17601						
Correspondence ID:	13723	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you, Nicole Brooker 12802 Monroe Manor Drive Oak Hill, VA 20171						
Correspondence ID:	13724	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 12:11:25						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I believe a more shared-use plan should be implemented allowing for appropriate flora & fauna protection without full beach closures.						
Correspondence ID:	13725	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 12:11:27						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	We own a rental property on Hatteras island, and have been visiting the island for the last 15 years. We treasure the lifestyle on the island and do not want to see further restrictions put in place. As it stands currently, we have already noticed considerable restrictions over the last few years. We have also noticed a drop in weekly rentals during this same period. We are dependent on the rental income and the property values, and we think there is a balance between conservation and allowing people to enjoy the natural resources the island has to offer. We oppose alternative F and any further restrictions on beach access for humans, pets, or vehicles.						
Correspondence ID:	13726	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule						

0012591

making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13727 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Rebecca English

Correspondence ID: 13728 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lea, James
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray:
I am writing as a homeowner in Buxton, a university professor and a long-time small business-person. I strongly object to the DEIS/ORV management plan released in March for public comment on grounds that the analysis of the economic impact of severely restricting Cape Hatteras National Seashore beach access on the lives and livelihoods of Outer Banks residents is incomplete, inadequate and misleading. The analysis cited in detail on pages 561-598 of the DEIS is still being conducted by RTI International and so cannot be considered complete and definitive. But the NPS has incorporated it into the DEIS at length and offers its pronouncements to justify a finding of an acceptable impact of beach closures on the small to mid-sized businesses of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. The survey on which the RTI analysis is based is regional, not locally specific to the eight communities within the Seashore, and does not accurately reflect the inevitable economic impact on those communities. It appears that local testimony regarding effects already felt since the consent decree was imposed in April, 2008, has not been taken seriously. On pages 281 and 284, the DEIS acknowledges that "... beach-related tourism drives the economy of the area." But none of the proposed Action Alternatives specifically provides for protecting that vital element of resident life from the impact on jobs, incomes, and ability to pay bills when recreational visitors are driven away by beach closures to vacation, fish, surf, bird watch and spend their dollars elsewhere. Nor does the analysis address the economic damage to the rest of North Carolina from the loss of revenues generated by the state's third-ranked producer of tourism-related taxes. As island tourism is dramatically diminished - as it will be if the DEIS goes forward as written -- the state's budgets for education, roads, social services and other mandates will go back to the chopping block or everyone's taxes will go up - or both. The DEIS should be withdrawn until a more complete and focused economic impact analysis can be completed. Thank you for the opportunity to offer these comments.

Correspondence ID: 13729 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
Our National Parks are precious treasures and we must do everything possible to protect them and the flora and fauna which inhabit them. Not only do I love visiting national parks, but I love knowing they are there safely protected for generations to come. We must do everything possible curb ORV use and protect 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.

Correspondence ID: 13730 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Tracy L. Williams 4009 Foxwood Dr Virginia Beach, VA 23462

Correspondence ID: 13731 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
GEOFFREY D. SLOAN, MD
13509 KALMBACKS MILL DR
FREDERICKSBURG, VA 22407

Correspondence ID: 13732 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Paquette, Patrick
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I believe the protections given to piping plovers in the DEIS go beyond what is needed to adequately protect Piping Plovers. I suggest the standards and protections to be used in CAHA should be the exact same as is used in the Cape Cod National Seashore where the most successful breeding area continues with ORV use. The use of 1000 meter buffers is excessive and not needed. CAHA should stick to and use standards as defined in Appendix G of the ESA.
I believe the use of Piping Plover protection standards for birds not listed under the ESA is not appropriate. Of course, when chicks are on the ground there must be some closed area however to treat all shorebirds the same as ESA listed shorebirds is excessive.

Correspondence ID: 13733 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lea, James
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: I am writing as a homeowner in Buxton, a long-time admirer of the unique beauty and visitorfriendly accessibility of the beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, a friend of the wildlife which flourishes there, and a strong supporter of rational, fair and balanced management of the public's vehicle and pedestrian access to the Seashore's public lands. In my view, the DEIS/ORV Management Plan released for public comment by the National Park Service in March, 2010, is deeply flawed and unacceptable as the basis for a permanent management plan. In this letter, I would like to comment specifically on the lack of credibility in what is offered in the DEIS as "the best available science" to support the plan's severe restrictions of beach access. What is presented as scientific substance is little more than scattered observations of bird, turtle and human behavior seasoned with the observers' preferences and promulgated without standard scientific review, instead of the peer-replicated independent experimental studies that would produce real scientific evidence. While the DEIS proposes to establish a setting for serious research in the Seashore sometime in the future, the Park Service must admit that virtually no such research has been conducted to this time. Nevertheless, planning for access restriction is proceeding as though there were a firm foundation of legitimate science to substantiate proposals like the 1000-meter buffer around unfledged plover chicks and the contention that ORVs are the major threat to plover reproductive success when available data clearly show predation and weather to be for more serious threats. Your positions on these and related issues are scientifically baseless. I ask you, Mr. Superintendent, to direct the Park Service's efforts toward the kind of access management that's represented in the pre-consent decree Interim Plan so that real science and cool objective thinking can be brought to bear on this critically important issue. Thank you for the opportunity to offer these comments. Sincerely,
James W. Lea

Correspondence ID: 13734 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Yingling, Kathryn R
Received: May,11,2010 12:13:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Kathryn Yingling 2220 Fairfax Drive Unit 710 Arlington, Virginia 22201
May 10, 2010
Mr. Michael Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Dr. Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Mr. Murray,
I am writing regarding the upcoming decision on beach access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I have been coming to Cape Hatteras for my entire life and my family now owns a home in Frisco. In my personal experience over the past thirty-one years, I have only seen people treating the beach environment with the utmost respect. It is a place where we can go with our children, parents, grandparents, enjoy nature at its best, and where I learned so much about caring for the environment.
I have seen many inconsistencies in the way the data has been presented and interpreted and feel that the facts put forth are not accurate or honest. My concerns:
1. The economic impact on the citizens of Cape Hatteras National Seashore has been enormous. According to what I have read, when considering the financial/economic impact, the areas of Duck, Corolla, Kitty Hawk, etc., have been included in the statistics. Nevertheless, anyone who has visited the CHNS knows that the inclusion of those towns will skew the results. The villages on CHNS are entirely different from the northern beaches and it is disingenuous to say otherwise. Tourism is what keeps CHNS economically viable and the only product that the people of these villages have to "sell" is the beach and the activities associated with it. They are very isolated with Rt. 12 and the ferries being the only way to get to those towns. If we are honest, we all know that they are hours from the northern beaches. Without beach access, they have nothing to offer the tourist. Honesty requires looking at the impact on the specific towns affected by the beach access issues.
2. Access for the elderly and the disabled. Driving on the beach has been the traditional way of access and has provided the elderly and disabled a way to enjoy the beautiful national park that we call Hatteras. In my particular case, my grandmothers would not be able to enjoy the area without the ability to drive to the point where we would set up for the duration of that day's visit. Walking across the sand is not an option for my grandmothers, and one day may also preclude my parents from enjoying the area as well. I know this to be true for many other visitors.
3. Buffer zones for the nesting birds and turtles. Where is the scientific evidence that 1000 meters in all directions is necessary for the protection of the nesting birds? This is widely known to be untrue. The "research" presented is very questionable. My parents, who were recently in the Galapagos Islands, found it very interesting to listen to the National Geographic naturalist who said very clearly that the American Oyster Catcher is not bothered by close foot traffic. That was evidenced by how closely they were allowed to walk to the AOC. They actually asked her to repeat her statement because it was in such opposition to what we have been hearing from the Audubon Society, Defenders of Wildlife and the NPS. 4. Why are birds that are not on the Endangered Species list being afforded the same protection as if they were? Some of these birds are being given equal or even more protective

status. Also, the NC Wildlife Resources Commission has specifically said that it was never their intent for these "species of concern" to be protected in this way.

5. When determining the bird population and also the success of the breeding season, why are you not including all the birds in the ecosystem? The dredge islands are very successful breeding areas as is Pea Island. It is dishonest to not count these birds and their successful breeding.

6. I ask that you, at the very least, provide corridors around the resource closures for pedestrians and vehicles through the entire breeding and nesting season.

7. Lastly, I ask that you remember the promises made by previous directors and superintendents to protect access for residents and visitors. And, please, look honestly at the evidence. Decisions should be based on actual fact and true, verifiable, scientific evidence as well as an honest evaluation of how the final decision will impact the humans beings who call Hatteras their home.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Yingling

Correspondence ID:	13735	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Gray, Bette				
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray,</p> <p>Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.</p> <p>After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.</p>				
Correspondence ID:	13736	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Lea, James				
Received:	May,05,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray:</p> <p>I am a Buxton, North Carolina, homeowner and a professor of family medicine at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. My family and I have for many years enjoyed the beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Today I am writing to express my strong disapproval of the DEIS/ORV management plan as written and to question the National Park Service's true goal in preparing the plan. It's clear that the NPS is rejecting all alternatives for enhancing and protecting the nesting habitat of the shore birds and the turtles except the ones that involve severely restricting access to the beaches by pedestrians and vehicles. The suggestion of expanding suitable bird habitat by removing vegetation around the salt ponds is tossed aside as unworkable in the DEIS. Yet clearing vegetation is a scientifically accepted means of enhancing piping plover nesting and feeding habitat that's practiced by other state and national parks on the East Coast. Reaching a target number of breeding pairs of plovers is the stated goal of the beach access management plan. But the NPS insists that only plover pairs on the Seashore beaches be counted toward the target number. The nesters on spoil and dredge islands within the Seashore ecosystem are purposefully disregarded. The NPS carries out an aggressive predator control program on behalf of the birds and turtles, but refuses to manage habitat conditions and to move turtle nests from exposed locations, claiming that such interference would not be environmentally sound. These contradictions are patently hypocritical, and they strongly suggest that the NPS's true goal is not to increase bird and turtle breeding productivity but to turn the Seashore recreational areas into an Audubon-approved wildlife refuge. The DEIS cherry picks arguments that support keeping recreational users off the beaches while choosing to ignore approaches that would help to create a fair and balanced access and use policy. I urge the Park Service to set aside all Action Alternatives described in the DEIS and give all of us a chance to work together to develop a rational beach access management plan whose goal is clear and unequivocal. Thank you for the opportunity to offer these comments. Sincerely, James W. Lea</p>				
Correspondence ID:	13737	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Carson, Robert				
Received:	May,05,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	<p>I am a year round permanent resident of Frisco, and a recreational surf fisherman who accesses Hatteras Island beaches year round with my ORV. I support free and open access to our beaches. I disagree with the beach closing at Cape Point, Hatteras Inlet, and Ocracoke Inlet due to wildlife nesting sites. An open year round corridor for ORVs around nesting sites is a more fair solution. I disagree with the minimum ten year time frame for closure of designated beaches on Hatteras Island due to wildlife nesting sites. A floating closure is a more practical solution given that nesting areas can change from season to season. To close an area for that time span based on what might be a one season event seems heavily weighed in favor of wildlife over human activity. I disagree with permitting ORVs. No permits are necessary. Sincerely,</p> <p>Robert Carson</p>				
Correspondence ID:	13738	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Andersen, Edward				
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>Dear Superintendent Murray, As I own 2 home in Hatteras Village - I would like to present my opinion in person but...</p> <p>Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.</p> <p>After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.</p> <p>A FAIR program must be in place.</p> <p>Regards.</p> <p>Edward A. Andersen 4720 Burnley Branch Lane Barboursville, VA 22923</p>				
Correspondence ID:	13739	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Wells, Mari				
Received:	May,11,2010 12:18:29				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>I disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. Pass-thru corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish the corridors and ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.</p> <p>Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.</p>				

Endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas. Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates. The US Park Services statement that businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules is irresponsible. The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible. Common sense says that less beach access equals less tourists, which equals less business revenue.

Correspondence ID: 13740 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Butler, Steven
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: The following are my comments on the NPS' Draft Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement.
 1. I agree and wholeheartedly support the Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement 2. I disagree with the title of the Plan as an "Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan". The Plan is really a beach access plan for ORV's, yes, but also for pedestrians. 3. I disagree that NPS has not included the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge with its 6000 acres and 13 miles of ocean beach that is pedestrian only year round. 4. I disagree that NPS has not included the thousands of birds that inhabit Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge and the nearby dredge and spoil islands which are part of the same eco-system as CHNS. The population of the entire eco-system must be included. 5. I disagree with NPS' decision to put into place closures of a much larger size than necessary for a list of bird species, none of which is endangered, and only one is considered to be threatened. It would appear that NPS has bowed to pressure from the environmental groups without regard to the effect of the closures on the residents of and visitors to CHNS. 6. I disagree with NPS and the Department of the Interior deciding to ignore the historical fact that CHNS was established as Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area and not as a wildlife refuge.

Correspondence ID: 13741 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Smith, Andrew R
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Andrew Smith Bryn Mawr, PA

Correspondence ID: 13742 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 12:19:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray Superintendent, Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo NC 27954
 Re: Comments on March 2010 Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan
 Dear Sir:
 I wish to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan (hereafter referred to as the DEIS) for which public comments are to be accepted until May 11, 2010.
 Specifically, I've thoroughly reviewed the DEIS, both for its impact on wildlife resources and its effect on the visiting public and the towns and villages along the national seashore. My concerns are enumerated below:
 1) The data and justifications, and therefore the validity of the proposed rules governing beach access by pedestrians and off-road vehicles of alternatives B, C, D, E, and F, appears to be crafted from exceptionally weak, or in some cases, no data. As an agency chartered with managing (and balancing) the needs of the public that fund the National Park Service and the wildlife within the national parks, national wildlife refuges, national seashores, and national monuments, it is your duty and responsibility to demand sufficient and credible data on the morbidity and mortality of wildlife within the park and their causes BEFORE drafting proposed rules that will significantly restrict access to any sector of the taxpaying public. Specifically, the sources cited within the DEIS as to the impact of the public on the wildlife within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore generally do not meet reasonable standards of proper scientific peer review and unbiased data collection and analysis. Many of the sources are more than 20 years old, and do not reflect modern analytical methods and technology that have become the standard for evaluating wildlife morbidity and mortality. It is your responsibility, therefore, to suspend the rulemaking process and revert the rules for access by the public to pre 2005 standards (i.e., before the lawsuit brought by the Audubon Society, et. al. , and subsequent consent decree) until valid, unbiased and sufficient studies that pass scientific scrutiny have been conducted to properly assess the impact that visitors to the CHNS have, and will continue to have, on the indigenous wildlife. 2) Even though the data used to support rule-making in the DEIS is weak and scientifically suspect, it rather clearly does not demonstrate that off road vehicles nor pedestrians on the beach interfere with wildlife breeding, feeding, nesting, or roosting behavior to any substantial degree. Yet the rules as proposed in options B, C, D, E, and F seem to be constructed as if impact by human visitors on the seashore, regardless of conveyance method, has a direct and substantial negative impact on this wildlife. Such blatant disregard from the NPS's own data, however, suspect is not acceptable, and will form the basis for immediate legal action against the proposed rules if adopted that wastes taxpayer money that could be expended on substantive and scientifically defensible wildlife morbidity and mortality studies. 3) Finally, the supporting documentation for the DEIS proposed rules as they exist in options B,C,D,E, and F do not consider the potential catastrophic impact they may have on the economic health of the citizens that live and make their livelihood based on visitors to the CHNS. No credible studies assessing this impact are referenced in the DEIS. Again, it is not acceptable for the NPS to propose rules that substantially restrict access by the taxpaying public from their natural resources based on such a paucity of objective data. I therefore conclude that none of the proposed options detailed in the DEIS for CHNS of March 2010 is acceptable save option A that returns access to the conditions in place before the legal action brought by the Audubon Society et. al., and subsequent consent decree until such time as credible and defensible wildlife and economic impact studies can be completed. To do otherwise is irresponsible, and possibly illegal under current Code of Federal Regulations rules and guidelines, and invites a protracted legal battle that wastes tremendous amounts of taxpayer money and NPS employee's time.
 Sincerely,
 David E. Keller, PhD.

Correspondence ID: 13743 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Hearington, Joseph W
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
 1401 National Park Drive
 Manteo, NC 27954
 Dear Superintendent Murray,
 Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

0012595

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. As a lifelong visitor and new homowner (I purchased my home in Waves on April 15, 2010), proper management of the natural resources is critical for the continued mutual benefit and enjoyment of the seashore. All six alternatives will drastically reduce human access and enjoyment island without significantly improving the plight of endangered or at-risk species.

I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13744 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 12:19:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I hate to see taxpayer money and the time and effort of officials being wasted on such a proposal as this!!! Are you NOT learning from what is going on?? Isn't there going to be enough oil slick along Louisiana's coast and beyond? Haven't we decimated enough land, air and water as it is over the last several decades?? Why on GOD's earth does anyone need to use ORV's on a beach other than for lifeguard emergencies??? What is wrong with people that they cannot enjoy GOD's creation as HE created it??? The beach, the mountains, and other wild places are to be revered, respected and used as a means of rejuvenating, inspiring and relaxation from the noise, crowds, material needs that man bombards himself with everyday! These places are sacred and should NOT be ruined by loud, obnoxious, speeding vehicles! Going to the beach is a place to escape, "rewind", breathe in the salty fresh air, listen to the wind and the waves and listen to the gulls. It is to be therapy from our hectic lives! NOT be subject to motors roaring, fumes and ignorant people who have no respect or consideration for Nature in it's purity. PLEASE DO NOT let ORV's on the beach!!!!!!!

Correspondence ID: 13745 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Shifflett, Jeremy
Received: May,11,2010 12:19:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am writing to comment on Document 2010 03Mar 05 - Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS.
I want you to know that my family and I visited Hatteras Island every year from 1992 to 2008 to spend time surf fishing and to enjoy the beach. We did not visit the Outer Banks in 2009 because of the beach closures and the negative impact they had on our ability to fish and enjoy the beach. We are not visiting the Outer Banks this year, either, for the same reason.
We typically spent about \$4,000 for a week of vacationing on Hatteras Island. The impact of your ORV management plans has been to keep our tourist dollars away from Hatteras Island. Unless your final plan re-opens the beaches to fishermen in ORVs our tourist dollars will not be returning.
Jeremy Shifflett

Correspondence ID: 13746 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Davis, candy c
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: please except this as my negative comments on orv deis before you at this time after reviewing the national pk deis i disagree with any of the six alternatives with the document. i however am in agreement with 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 matintaining 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.
Candy Davis 42069 pheasant cr Avon, NC 27915

Correspondence ID: 13747 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Russo, Daniel
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: I am responding to the NPS DEIS that affects not only my way of life but to those of thousands that visit Cape Hatteras National Seashore, now and for years to come. My family and I are avid surf fishing enthusiasts but we also enjoy all of nature's offerings when we come to the Outer Banks including bird watching, shell picking, swimming, sunrises and just breathing the great salt air. We use our off road vehicle to pursue these activities. It is therefore that I support the response from the Coalition For Beach Access as to the options listed by NPS.
MY MOST CONCERNS ARE: 1) CLOSING OFF TOO MUCH AREAS FOR BIRD PRE-NESTING, NESTING AND FLEDING PERIODS 2) CLOSING OFF TOO MUCH AREAS FOR TURTLE NESTING PERIODS Why can't these closures be more reasonable like what is standard in other parks and most notably like what is used just north on Pea Island. The species that you are currently going overboard to protect are not endangered or threatened and represent an extremely small fraction of what their populations are and where they breed. 3) WHEN YOU CLOSE THE BEACHES AND THE BEST FISHING AREAS YOU CHOKO THE ECONOMICS OUT OF THE VILLAGES ON HATTERAS ISLAND 4) CLOSING THE BEACHES MAKE IT DIFFICULT OR IMPOSSIBLE FOR ELDERLY, DISABLED AND SMALL CHILDREN TO ACCESS AND ENJOY AREAS THAT ARE NOT CROWDED Thank You for entering and recording my comments. Best Regards, Daniel J Russo

Correspondence ID: 13748 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you for your consideration, Dr. and Mrs. Stephen F. Cleary 12001 Middlewood Circle Midlothian, VA 23113 also: 40328 Beachcomber Dr. Avon, NC 27915

Correspondence ID: 13749 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Basilone, Joe
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: I disagree with the DEIS about a pet policy as stated on Page 136. The policy prohibits pets in the seashore from March 15 to July 31. The Park Service already has regulations concerning unleashed pets and these regulations should be enforced. Additional extremely restrictive pet regulations are not justified by the available data. I disagree with the DEIS proposed restrictive measures and inflexible buffers as found on pages 121-127 and page 468.

These will prevent ORV use on large portions of the National Seashore. I agree with efforts to establish reasonable access corridors so that ORVs can reasonably access the surf zone in the National Seashore. I advocate the Coalition for Access 77 page proposal.

Correspondence ID: 13750 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Conover, William R
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
 1401 National Park Drive
 Manteo, NC 27954
 Dear Superintendent Murray,
 Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
 After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
 I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
 Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
 William Conover
 836 Olive Lane
 Pottstown, Pa 19465

Correspondence ID: 13751 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 12:22:12
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: 13752 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 12:22:12
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: 13753 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 12:22:18
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: 13754 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 12:22:18

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: 13755 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 12:22:35

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Mike Murray, I have been coming down to the Outer Banks of North Carolina for approximately 20 years. Not just once a year, but several times a year. I load up my family of 4 children and drive 6 hours to get there to enjoy the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Park. My children as well as myself look forward to these trips every single year. I can not even begin to imagine how many dollars I have spent over the last 20 years in the local economy whether it be on fishing tackle, food, gas, lodging or whatever. One of the reason that I am drawn to the area is because of the ability to access the beach at many different points or ramps. For 20 years or so, my children have been raised to respect the park and its wildlife, always careful / mindful to stay away from the turtle nesting areas or roped off bird nesting areas. As a whole I believe that the public in general has done the same. For years people and the wildlife have been able to co-exist without any problems, that was what the National Park was all about. Along comes the Consent decree, fishermen and beach goers are made out to look like Red Necks or lunatics driving around in big trucks running over little birds ever chance they get.. the fact of the matter is that this is completely incorrect. These same so called lunatics over the past 20 years are the same ones that respect and take care of the park. I can't tell you how many times I have stopped to pick up litter as it washes up on the shore. " leave with more than than you brought additude " that was taught to me by and old fisherman. These are the same people that" police " the beaches and teach some of the younger more rambunctious crowd about respect of public lands and wildlife. I guess I must be one of them too, I own a successful business in Va, I am 41 year old married father of 4 who likes to go to the beach with his family to enjoy what the park is all about. I would consider myself an avid fisherman as well as my children and my wife, we all fish (or try to fish)but we are always respectful of the environment and the wildlife around us. On our trip down last summer, I was asked by my youngest daughter why the beach was roped off " I told her that the beach was closed to traffic either by car or by foot due to a bird nesting area " she immediately pointed to an area that has been roped off on Ocracoke island for as long as I or she can remember as a bird nesting area. That's where the birds are suppose to nest. Why did they close the beach ? I spend several hours trying to explain the why to this little inquisitive mind, I'm still to this day not convinced that she understands. She has played in the waters of South point Ocracoke every Summer since birth 11 years ago and I'm telling her that its no longer open to the public due to a bird nest. Something must be done about this Consent Decree, People and wildlife have co-existed on this planet for as long as we all know. Whose to say that this bird no longer wants to fly this far south to nest. Whose to say that the temperature or wind currents haven't changed making it a less desirable place to nest. I do not understand the ability of a Federal judge to be able to take away the enjoyment of a little girl or a families freedom to enjoy a public land such as a National Park due to a birds nest. This makes absolutly no sense. This is the meer foundation of the National Park Service, Its whole purpose was to set aside land and protect it from development for the enjoyment of people . Generations of people, fathers, mothers, grandparents, children and grand children not birds. As I have traveled back and forth from North Carolina in the past few years I have noticed an increased number of businesses forsale or closed down due to what I believe to be closed beaches. I have actually found myself checking the NPS website to see what beaches are open before I head down with my family, because I do not want to be faced with the same question from an even smarter little girl. I have cancelled a few of those spur of the moment trips on more than one occasion due to beach access issues. I can not imagine what effect closed beaches are having on the families who own businesses down the Outer Banks of North Carolina trying to survive in an already tough economy. It has to be devastating and my heart goes out to them, but why should I head south to North Carolina if cant participate in the things that my family enjoys the most ? There is no way that this hasn't had an economic impact on these people

or even the entire state of North Carolina department of tourism. Whatever study had or has been done to state that this would have no impact must have been done by someone that was completely incompetent or had blinders on. They say that statistics can be manipulated in anyway which suits the user but I dare you to go and ask the people. Ask the business owners and realstate owners, ask the ferry docks personnel, ask the people whose jobs and families depend on their income if closed beaches have had and effect and they will tell you that they have without a doubt. It all boils down to economics ... less people ... less vacationers ... less revenue .. not only for local business but for the entire state of North Carolina. So what does a state have to do that is experiencing a huge economic loss ? Cut jobs, cut services, and raise taxes to make up the difference. Lets go ahead and raise state taxes on people who are already suffering. Its really kind of sad but undeniably true. There has to be a happy medium somewhere, before this whole Consent Decree I know that certain areas were closed off as bird nesting areas and I completely understood and respected that, any decent human being would. I understood that the first 20 + miles or so of Pea Island is a wildlife refuge and can not be driven on, I accept that! I understood that certain areas were " bird nesting areas" and were "off limits" everyone seemed to abide by that. What is unacceptable to me is the constant changing of the boundries and barriers and rules imposed by the Consent decree, closing down what little beach is actually axcessible in a National "for the people" Park ! What is unacceptable to me is to watch an economy, and way of life that has been passed down from grandfather to father to sons be ruined by a faceless group so called the Defenders of Wildlife. I closing I would just like to say that if 1/1000th of the money that was spent on attorneys, legal battles and so called studies would have been spent on educating the people that travel to North Carolina about the unique dynamic beauty of the barrier islands, and how important it is to respect nature (and its balance) and to preserve it for future generations to come, would have been money better spent. Cape Hatteras National Seashore is an important part of the North Carolina department of tourism and a National Park that should be enjoyed by all. Thank you for your time .
William O'Hop and Family

Correspondence ID:	13756	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Guilfoyle, Helen M				
Received:	May,11,2010 12:22:37				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I disagree and object to the proposed rule regarding Special Use Permits for transporting a handicapped person to the Village Beaches. If me daughter must return her vehicle to the street it will leave me unattended for a long period of time while she leaves the beach, parks someplace, and walks back to me. And again when we want to leave the beach. I disagree with Option F				
Correspondence ID:	13757	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Busbey, Carol				
Received:	May,05,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Letter				
Correspondence:	My husband and I have owned a water sport related business in Buxton on Hatteras Island for the past 33 years. The nature of our business requires us to visit the beach here daily so we are very aware of the ocean and weather conditions. Beach access is an important part of visiting our seashore recreation area. I feel it is important to keep access open to the most popular of the areas visited, especially Cape Point and Hatteras South Point. A corridor at the high tide line should be kept open to allow access to these areas. Cutting off these areas that have been so popular over the years is a sin. The one thing i noted when we drove out to Cape Point last Sunday night was all of the birds were outside of their roped off area and hanging out around the humans. Humans mean food and protection. Reasonable roped off corridors should exist as they have in the past.				
Correspondence ID:	13758	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	private				
Received:	May,11,2010 12:22:51				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	By committing this travesty, you will further entrench my belief that the park service does not have the well being of the general public at heart, but would rather run a park free of humans. Congratulations, this bloated government bureaucracy filled with do-gooders is shockingly disconnected with the public. And it is all thanks to your head in the ground approach to public relations. This ORV Management bill does not take into account the real world. What wildlife is worth keeping? Why is it acceptable to kill predators, but not other species? Welcome to nature, you're supposed to work in it. And more importantly, you are killing off the livelihood of an entire society. YOU are furthering the economic situation that we are in. The mentality I get from the park service is the sooner that humans are gone from this planet, the better. Save the animals, screw the humans. Despicable.				
Correspondence ID:	13759	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Conover, Shirley A				
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Shirley Conover 836 Olive Lane Pottstown, Pa 19465				
Correspondence ID:	13760	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Conover, Ernest W				
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.				

I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Ernest Conover
1825 Glen Eagles Dr
Pottstown, Pa 19464

Correspondence ID: 13761 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 12:25:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not block the beach. Surfers and fishermen are responsible stewards of the environment.

Correspondence ID: 13762 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Messenger, William
Received: May,11,2010 12:25:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
One of the great pleasures in America is visiting the remarkable beaches from shore to shore, including the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Seashore is a nationally significant resource with its sandy beaches, salt marshes, and maritime woods on the storied Outer Banks of North Carolina. This area is cherished by family vacationers, bird watchers, and many other people who enjoy undeveloped beaches. All of the alternatives presented in the draft environmental impact statement privilege ORV use over all other visitors. Overall, this approach is unbalanced and fails to conserve and protect the wilderness, birds, and turtles that make this area nationally significant. Of the six alternative plans outlined in the draft, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D, if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,
William Messenger

Correspondence ID: 13763 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 12:25:38
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Alternative A (2007 FOSNI Interim Strategy) for the purposes of Species/Resource Management and the current ORV Management Policies are the only option in the DEIS that accomplishes what was envisioned in the 1930s when the park was created. Around 1952, fifteen years after he submitted the act to create Cape Hatteras National Seashore, then former Congressman Lindsay C. Warren made the following statement:
"When I introduced the bill for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore in 1937, I would have nothing to do with it unless the people were fully protected forever in their hunting and fishing rights, and unless there was a guarantee of a hard-surface road if the Government came into the picture, and unless all of the villages were exempt. At that time there was very little prospect for a paved road, but I extracted a promise from the NPS that they would favor such a road to be built, whenever possible, either through State or Federal Aid funds. Frankly, I think that this Park will mean more to the people of Dare County than anything that could ever happen to them. I do not say that because I was the author of the bill, but I say it because I had studied the history of all Parks, before I came into the picture back in 1937."
As stated above, the creation of the park took many years of negotiation with the residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. At the time residents were presented with two other options for development--namely, oil exploration and accepting outside developers. The residents' acceptance of the national seashore as their preferred option for development was based upon Conrad Wirth's promise that the parks' beaches would always be open to all people, that the park would not compete with the villages for tourists' dollars, and that the NPS would "stand ready to cooperate with you at all times in the development of your communities, if you want us to." That is, the residents saw the park as a way to retain their primary way of life while still taking advantage of the higher living standard offered by a modern national economy.
It's the NPS and the DOI's duty to make certain that they do everything possible to retain the traditional way of life for the residents and visitors of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands and to live up the commitments that were made to the residents which allowed for the creation of the park.

Correspondence ID: 13764 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Baxter, Bonnie W
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Bonnie Baxter
1825 Glen Eagles Dr
Pottstown, Pa 19464

Correspondence ID: 13765 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Davis sr, mike a
Received: May,11,2010 12:26:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly disagree with the deis and the 6 alternatives within the document. look at the coalintion for beach access position statemnt signed by several gruops that wree a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in covering birds and people.

Correspondence ID: 13766 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Clark, Wayne
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Dear Sir: The purpose of this correspondence is to express my concern and offer comments as to the "preferred plan" of access as is now presented by the NPS. I note the following; curtailing the use of the Park relative to "historical use" will and is having a substantial, negative impact on our small, family owned and operated Lodging Business on Ocracoke Island (21 Rental Units). Current Year To Date Reservations and Income are off substantially; Reservations being down 27% with Revenues being off 30%. In my view, the Park Service's increasingly stringent policy as to "limiting access" is and has been a major contributor to these substantial decreases. As to the Plan as recommended by the NPS, I have concern/comments relative to the following:

1. Limitations on Access to ocean front beach: a. South Point on Ocracoke (too restrictive) b. North End on Ocracoke (too restrictive) c. Restrictions as to availability beyond what has been historical prior to the "Consent Decree". 2. It is my understanding that the economic study for the Outer Banks is still underway; so the DEIS plan used the visitor demographics for Fort Raleigh and Wright Brothers in their assessment of economic impact. There was no mention that even within Cape Hatteras National Park, there are different demographics for Ocracoke versus Oregon Inlet. This is a significant flaw in the document! An economic study particular to areas south of the Oregon Inlet Bridge needs to be done separate and apart from other areas of the park. Hatteras and Ocracoke have particular dynamics (importance of specific types of beach access) that are significantly different from the "commercialize type use" by Tourists of the Northern Beaches. This issue is too important (dealing with people's livelihood) to not be completely researched and documented. 3. The curtailment of night driving on the beach will and is negatively impacting tourism in the following ways: a. Surf Fisherman will no longer be able to fish at "peak fishing times". b. Visitors will no longer be able to have "family gatherings" at night on the beach relative to "star gazing" and "camp fires/cook outs". Historical use as to night driving on the beach should be the rule. Other means of protecting the environment need to be identified and used that do not curtail night driving on the beach. b. Regulations that allow no provision for pets on the beach will negatively impact use of the Park and thus our local economy. The "continuance" of the "pets on a leash rule" should remain as is with no provision for change. 4. Buffer Areas should return to "minimum historical sizes" prior to the Consent Decree. At no time should Buffer Areas totally prohibit access to areas that are adjacent to "closed areas" when there is space for a corridor or Interdunal path. 5. A Vehicle permitting system is something that can be accommodated but with a provision that allows for a Permanent Resident to have a year round permit at no cost. This would be similar to the Hatteras Ferry Pass permanent residents now have. 6. Issues that Determine the quality of life of the residents of Ocracoke and Hatteras Islands I note that many Residents and Tourists/Nisitors use the Park by way of their ORV on the Ocean Front. Of these Users many have physical handicaps caused by age and or disabilities or have "specialty needs" for small children or "recreational equipment use". Historical RV Access is extremely important to these Users given their physical limitations. Historical Access should be maintained to accommodate these important Users of the Park. 7. Why does NPS refuse to acknowledge that Pea Island is a prime, pedestrian-only area for visitors to the seashore and overstate the need for more ORV free areas? 8. Possible Mitigating Factors to Economic Impact of "restrictions of use": a. Access CorridorS/Interdunal Paths need to be put in place to provide maximum access to the entire beach when certain parts of it are closed for environmental/habitat reasons. At no time should a part of the beach be totally restricted when there is no reason specific to that particular part of the beach. b. An "access trail" needs to be put in place that runs parallel to the Sound Side Beach with appropriate parking provided at different spots along the trail. This will provide an off set when areas of the ocean front have to be closed. This would provide access as per the back side of Hatteras Island south of the Ferry Dock. In addition, a Sound Side Public Beach needs to be put in place that is comparable to the Ocean Side Public Beach on Ocracoke. This will provide an alternative for Park Users when the Ocean Front Beach is less than desirable as to weather conditions (wind) and parts of the Ocean Beach is closed for environmental/habitat reason. 9. Both of the "referred to designated areas" (South Point and the North End of Ocracoke) and historical uses that have been and are important to Park Users; especially Surf Fisherman. Curtailing or eliminating "historical use" is resulting in a decrease in Visitors (both beach combers and surf fisherman) coming to our Island. In my view we are already experiencing that relative to Surf Fisherman especially. Given the local Economy has been built around these important historical uses of the Park. it is "terribly wrong" to "change the uses allowed" given the negative economic impact it is having and will have. Other means of mitigating concerns as to Environmental and Habatat should be explored and implemented. At a minimum, the proposed "changes to use" will decrease occupancy and revenue for our small lodging business. Worst case is that it will decrease occupancy to the extent that it will no longer be feasible to "stay in business". This will eliminate jobs for at least 3 families on the Island and two part time employees. This will result in the families no longer being able to make a living on the Island thus having to move away. If the NPS puts in place permanent restrictions that impact historical use. it should have to pay all businesses and individuals appropriately as to the negative impact it will have on their business. personal income and real property values. If this does not occur. the NPS by way of its proposed changes will directly cause for economic hardship without compensation. A "buyout" similar to what the Government did for Tobacco Farmers would be justified. It is my view that "legal remedies" as to compensation for "loss of use" will deserve consideration should the Park be substantially change historical uses of the Park. Your consideration of my comments/statements and questions in the development of the Plan is appreciated.
- H. Wayne Clark Edwards of Ocracoke Rooms and Cottages

Correspondence ID: 13767 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Dufala, Allen
Received: May,11,2010 12:30:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Mike Murray

As a home owner and part time resident of Hatteras Island I object to the plan to close the beaches. We should all be able to access the beach, swim in the ocean, and enjoy freedom. With the turtles the park service should mark and move the nests to pea island or the areas currently marked for the park service (strip between avon & Buxton) With the plover mark the nest sites and almost all people will respect the nesting privacy I am concerned the the reports of the mass destruction of wild like on the island to protect the plover and I hope that these reports are unfounded We can all work together providing areas for the wild life and people I just takes thinking & effort
 Allen Dufala 412 915 6195

Correspondence ID: 13768 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Finley, George B
Received: May,11,2010 12:30:34
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I disagree to buffers for unlisted birds. I disagree that the beach between ramps 27 and 30 will be closed to ORV's year round I disagree that night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15.

Correspondence ID:	13769	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	N/A, N/A				
Received:	May,11,2010 12:33:45				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	We advocate keeping the beaches of the Cape Hatteras recreational area free and open for public use. In this recreational area, we also advocate brief and finite closures of discrete (i.e. non-continuous) sections of the beaches due to endangered wildlife. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a recreational area - not a wildlife sanctuary - and it should be preserved as it was originally designated - for the non-destructive pleasure and use of the citizens and legal guests of the USA.				
Correspondence ID:	13770	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	private				
Received:	May,11,2010 12:34:28				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I feel I must comment on the "beach plan" that the NPS is trying to implement for the closure of many of Hatteras Island's beaches. The NCWRC has already stated that the recommended actions and mixing of rules for endangered vs non-endangered species does not make sense. The recommended 300 meter closure in all directions of the American Oystercatcher nest or brood really does not make sense. This species is not listed as federally threatened. I totally disagree with the 1000 meter pedestrian/ORV closure in all directions of the piping plover chick. There have been numerous articles stating that there is "no scientific reasoning that has been presented for this management strategy". To close beaches to pedestrian, visitors and permanent residents, and their dogs and any ORVs will surely devastate an already critical economy. I do know that the beach in front of one of my houses was closed last summer do to a Least Tern nest. Luckily there was a small area that the renters were able to access to the beach. If visitors and people that live on Hatteras Island cannot walk on the beach, play in the ocean, and appreciate nature, like they have been able to do for centuries, the island will be ruined. The economic impact from such rules will surely have a trickle down effect on thousands of people who own, work, visit, and live on the Hatteras Island. I agree that NPS need a viable management plan for all parks, but please do not go from one extreme to another, when many people have put there life into their homes, businesses, and investments. There has to be a balance between what is best for the park and what is reasonable for the people who live and work on the island. Please, please, please consider the lives that your decision will impact.				
Correspondence ID:	13771	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Blakney, Harold				
Received:	May,11,2010 12:34:57				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	I disagree with the DEIS as presented, as it is flawed in its basic evaluation baselines. The baselines as stated are: "evaluates the impacts of two no-action alternatives (A and B)" but these no-action alternatives are taken AFTER severe restrictions had already been placed on beach access by a consent decree. A "no-action" alternative should be based on baselines that have metrics that can be measured and truly evaluated such as the long standing NPS Interim Plan that had been used as a stop-gap measure until this DEIS could be developed. I cannot support the concept that all the years leading up to and PRIOR to the consent decree would not account for any baseline data points in developing any of the no-action alternatives. This is a gross misrepresentation of the data available. Instead, no-action alternatives should, at the minimum, use the very successful Interim Plan as one of the alternatives.				
Correspondence ID:	13772	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	private				
Received:	May,11,2010 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, Michelle Sheridan				
Correspondence ID:	13773	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Lyons, Marcia M				
Received:	May,11,2010 12:36:31				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Public comment on CAHA ORV Mgt Plan DEIS Thank you for the opportunity to express my views on the various alternatives. My three major areas of concern are: 1. The protection of the Park's natural resources including flora, fauna, coastal habitat and the natural barrier island processes that promote their health and sustainability. 2. Preservation and promotion of NPS values including natural, scenic and esthetic and their benefit and inspiration provided to the public. 3. Implementation of an efficient, sustainable alternative with a permit fee that would cover operational costs. I will refer mainly to Plan D, the preferred environmental plan and Plan F, the NPS preferred alternative. As my comments suggest, I agree with incorporating parts of Plan F into parts of Plan D. I also find a lack of permanent high quality pedestrian-only beaches in all alternatives that need to be rectified in the final plan. I do not support the no action plans A and B or major components of the other action plans C and E.				

Wetlands I agree with Plan F in erecting signage to delineate all ORV routes, parking and limits on soundside roads. I disagree with absence of signage in Plan D, as it is in conflict with the Organic Act, Redwood amendment, CAHA Enabling Legislation, applicable Executive Orders and NPS Policies. Vegetation damage and soil compaction are well visible and documented. Vehicle routes should not be established parallel to the sound shoreline as vegetation that buffer the island during storms would be killed. Also, most salt marsh shorelines in the park are retreating in the absence of ocean overwash due to artificial dune lines as well as sea level rise. ORV activity exacerbates the erosion by killing vegetation and driving on undercut shorelines. Comparing aerial photographs will show that unregulated soundside driving has resulted in the establishment of wider and/or additional ORV trails. Marsh habitats recover slowly. The best protection for wetland resources would be to replace routes with parking lots and maintaining foot trails to the water's edge. Additional interdunal roads would be built through fresh water wetlands under Plan F. Based on past experience, it would be difficult to keep users from going off trail to avoid passing through standing water or to allow oncoming traffic to pass (even if periodic turnouts are provided). Building the road high to keep dry and wide enough to accommodate traffic would mean the building of a large culvert trail through the wetlands.

Floodplains I agree with the need for more parking areas to promote pedestrian access. To reduce environmental impacts, parking lots should not be constructed with asphalt (that will eventually end up in the water) but with porous material such as crushed rock or patio pavement. Twelve additional lots proposed in Plan F will likely be extravagant since so many beaches are open to ORV use. Plan D needs to include additional parking areas since more beaches will be closed to vehicles.

T and E Species Piping Plover ? I agree with Plan D over Plan F. Suitable breeding and nonbreeding habitat has dwindled to a fraction of what it was when the park was established due to maintaining artificial dune/berm lines and suppression of ocean overwash events. Increase visitor activities and the resulting increase in presence of avian and mammalian predators have further impacted the species survival. Minimal or nonexistent protective efforts by the NPS for many decades after the park's inception have had extreme negative consequences. NPS needs to take a more aggressive action now for past failings, even those unintentional. The Organic Act, Threatened and Endangered Species Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, Redwood amendment, CAHA Enabling Legislation, applicable Executive Orders and NPS Policies support or mandate such actions. Plan D with ML1 will provide highest degree of protection for the next 5 years when it can be re-evaluated. I also support Plan D because pets are unacceptable near breeding and non-breeding SMAs.

On pg. 210 of the DEIS, it states that no known piping plover were lost to vehicles within CAHA. This is misleading. It should be noted that their nesting activity on ORV beaches was not protected until the late 1980s. The protective buffers were smaller than FWS recommendations and monitoring staff was low until recently. It is reasonable to believe that vehicles may have run over chicks in the past and it went undetected. Close calls were documented by NPS in three separate years in the 1990s when plover chicks were observed outside or at the edge of the bird closure prompting the park to extend the closure at the South beach drain to the surf edge.

Sea Turtles ? Similar to Piping Plover, suitable nesting habitat has dwindled since the park was established due to maintaining artificial dune/berm lines and suppression of ocean overwash events. Increase visitor activities and the resulting increase in mammalian predators have further impacted the species survival. Minimal or nonexistent protective efforts by the NPS for many decades after the park's inception have had negative consequences. NPS needs to take a more aggressive action now for past failings, even those unintentional. The Organic Act, Threatened and Endangered Species Act, Redwood amendment, CAHA Enabling Legislation, applicable Executive Orders and NPS Policies support or require stronger actions.

I applaud the park for having night driving restrictions in all alternatives. I do not agree with Plan D that vehicles have to be off the beach every evening at 7 PM. Using sunset hours as in F is reasonable though a daily moving target for visitors could prove frustrating. A compromise of 8 PM could be made without impacting nesting activity. My concern on both D and F is with the morning hour. I don't see how all beaches could be surveyed by such an early hour ? unless many more biotechs are now involved in surveying smaller sections of beach. It is true that after the peak hatching period, some stretches of beaches may no turtle activity. If there are no nests on a stretch of beach and vehicle lights could not be seen at any other distant nests that was in its hatching window, then the beach could be opened to vehicles by permit. Filter fence should not be relied upon to block light since it cannot successfully be secured to the low water mark. At least twice CAHA staff has documented hatchling entanglement after fabric was frayed by wind.

If beach fires are to be allowed, I agree with the spatial restrictions on campfires found in Plan F. However fires should be extinguished by 10 PM at latest to protect nesting sea turtles. (Also, consider safety and aesthetics as these village beaches are presently littered with beach fire debris left behind) Sea-beach amaranth ? If this endangered species has not been seen since 2005 in CAHA, the park must be extremely proactive in its recovery. CAHA has never protected habitat all year as proposed under Plan D. This plan could have major positive impacts by providing permanent protection of habitat, seeds and plants. Natural plant succession is likely eliminating suitable habitat on the upper beach. Plan D protects more lower beach habitat over a longer period than other alternatives. East Carolina University found that amaranth growing on the lower beach were larger and produced more seeds than those growing on the upper beach. I also support D since it is not known what impact vehicles have on seeds. Newly germinated plants are especially vulnerable under ML2 procedures proposed under F. I support reintroduction efforts proposed in Plan F. The Organic Act, Threatened and Endangered Species Act, Redwood amendment, CAHA Enabling Legislation, applicable Executive Orders and NPS Policies support or require stronger actions.

State Listed / Species of special status I agree with Plan D over Plan F. Suitable breeding and nonbreeding habitat has dwindled to a fraction of what it was when the park was established due to maintaining artificial dune/berm lines and suppression of ocean overwash events. Increase visitor activities and the resulting increase in presence of avian and mammalian predators have further impacted the species survival. Minimal or nonexistent protective efforts by the NPS for many decades after the park's inception have had dangerously negative consequences. NPS needs to take a more aggressive action now for past failings, even those unintentional. The Organic Act, Threatened and Endangered Species Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, Redwood amendment, CAHA Enabling Legislation, applicable Executive Orders and NPS Policies support or mandate such actions. Plan F with ML1 will provide highest degree of protection for the next 5 years when it can be re-evaluated. I also support Plan D because pets are unacceptable near breeding and non-breeding SMAs.

I fully support "floating" closures for non-breeding birds under Plan F. This gives additional protection to migratory and wintering birds that feed along the surf zone and rest on the upper beach such as red knot, sanderling, willit, whimbrel and black-bellied plover. Several of these species have dwindling populations. "Floating" closures should not replace closures at spits and point that incorporate sand/mud flats and inshore waters that many species prefer.

Permit/Education I strongly agree with Plan F proposal to tie resource protection education into the permit process. It has more positive returns than a permit with no education.

Safety Closures Park should definitely identify safety closures based on specific criteria. Plan F includes pedestrian safety ? only responsible thing to do if pedestrians and ORVs will be in the same area.

Park Values/Visitor Experience. NPS Management Policies make a clear tie between preserving and protecting park resources with safeguarding park values. In an overview of these management policies on pages 527 - 528, the DEIS states that (1) the enjoyment of park resources and values are part of the fundamental purpose of each park; (2) the NPS will ensure that the users would not cause impairment or unacceptable impacts to resources or values; (3) when uses and protection of resources and values conflict, protection of resources and values must predominate; (4) preferred forms of enjoyment that foster understanding and appreciation of the resources and values, contribute to personal growth, wellbeing, health and fitness will be actively promoted in accordance with the Organic Act. The DEIS follows in stating that the related Executive Orders require ORV routes and areas be allowed only in locations where there will be no adverse impact on natural, scenic or esthetic values and where they will minimize conflicts with other user groups I do not agree that any of the various alternatives presented do enough to protect or promote park values on a year round basis. The experience of some visitors is compromised and degraded as a result.

The park plans give preferential consideration to vehicles over protecting and promoting park values and pedestrians seeking to experience park values. In Plan F, pg 554 of DEIS, the 29 miles dedicated as year round ORV areas vastly out weighs 16 miles set aside as year round pedestrian sites. An additional 23 miles of SMA beach will be open to beach driving 7.5 months/year as opposed to 4.5 months as vehicle-free. It is unlikely that pedestrians will have access to the SMAs during the vehicle-free period due to resource needs. So under Plan F, vehicles will have access to 52 miles of beach for many months of the year leaving only 16 miles vehicle-free. I object to NPS dedicating more area to visitors with vehicles than for those without. Who decided vehicles get preference? Pedestrians who want to safely experience park values will avoid ORV beaches at CAHA. . Page 268 of the DEIS states that 18% of visitors surveyed found vehicles distracted from their experience. This does not take into account past visitors who no longer come here due to such conflicts. This needs to be re-evaluated with consideration of park values based on the above mentioned park policies, executive orders

as well as the Organic Act and enabling legislation.

Even along beaches shared by ORVs and pedestrians, the park gives greater consideration to the vehicles. In Plan F, a year round pedestrian-only corridor on the upper beach will be granted only if there is at least a 90-foot wide swath for vehicles. If a beach does not meet the criteria, (the case along most beaches) then pedestrians must walk in traffic and ruts. Public comments concerning close proximity of vehicles to other activities were cited on page 268 of the DEIS. I do not agree with the park's analysis that the vehicles need such a wide swath. It visually degrades the landscape and negatively impacts other users. No standard is even made for ORV corridor except in the No Action Plan A. After Hurricane Isabel in 2003, members of an NPS management team recommended 45' maximum width. Furthermore, pedestrians seeking to safely experience park values will not visit beaches dominated by vehicles. This needs to be re-evaluated with consideration of park values based on the above mentioned park policies, executive orders as well as the Organic Act and enabling legislation.

This disproportional consideration at the expense of preserving park values is seen further. Wherever vehicles are allowed, their activities dominate over other non-vehicle activities. The beach serves as a rutted multilane road and parking lot. Even visitors who access the beach with vehicles do not set blankets, chairs etc on the open beach (a rutted roadway) but instead between parked vehicles or between the ocean and parked vehicles. The parked ORVs act as a safety fence against moving vehicles. This needs to be re-evaluated with consideration of park values based on the above mentioned park policies, executive orders as well as the Organic Act and enabling legislation.

No plan adequately deals with carrying capacity. I do not believe the NPS considered natural aesthetics of the beachscape when reaching a recommendation. Under Plan F, one vehicle every 20' is high density and also unclear if this refers to a single or multiple row of vehicles along the shoreline. This needs to be re-evaluated with consideration of park values based on the above mentioned park policies, executive orders as well as the Organic Act and enabling legislation.

Each action alternative states that NPS will establish ORV routes and areas at sites having low visitor use. I disagree with this analysis. These sites may have low visitor use because they are less accessible due to remoteness. These are often the most wild, dynamic and deserted beaches and should be the very ones designated as year round pedestrian-only sites in order to protect park values and visitor experience. These areas would equate to permanent backcountry trails seen in other NPS units. Park visitors expect such options and not just on a seasonal basis. This needs to be re-evaluated with consideration of park values based on the above mentioned park policies, executive orders as well as the Organic Act and enabling legislation.

Many of the beaches chosen as year round pedestrian-only sites have little park value. For example on Hatteras Island, artificial dunes/berm and the highway border the Frisco site for its entire length. The beach running from Buxton village to the old lighthouse site is steep and narrow, bordered by commercial structures, artificial dunes/berm, sand fence, sand bags, metal groins and for much of its length, the highway. The southern section of this vehicle-free beach is highly valuable. Here a visitor can find a broad beach with natural dunes and a landscape dominated by barrier island process. However even the viewscape on this short stretch is compromised by the high number of vehicles using the bordering beach to the south. This needs to be re-evaluated with consideration of park values based on the above mentioned park policies, executive orders as well as the Organic Act and enabling legislation.

I greatly support the Plan F foot trail at Bodie Island spit and vehicle-free beaches on both sides of Hatteras Inlet. The inlet landscapes are wild, overwashed and ever changing where one can experience a barrier island in its true form. At Hatteras Inlet, the experience may not be remote depending on the size and location of new interdunal parking lots. The situation on the northern side of the inlet will not satisfy the needs of pedestrians seeking to enjoy a remote and wild beach since they still must traverse approximately 1.5 miles of rutted ORV beach or interdunal trail to access the pedestrian-only site. Only on the southern side would pedestrians have a quality experience and follow the vehicle-free shoreline to the inlet.

These and other high value beaches bordering inlets and the cape are extremely likely to be closed to pedestrians for a minimum of 4.5 months under F or longer under D ? which I will not argue with. However this emphasizes the need for the park to dedicate valuable year round vehicle-free beaches in other areas of the park. This needs to be re-evaluated with consideration of park values based on the above mentioned park policies, executive orders as well as the Organic Act and enabling legislation.

Analysis of the soundscape was incomplete. It did not consider that the likelihood of noise pollution in the form of dueling radios, tailgate parties etc. increase with the presence of ORVs. This needs to be re-evaluated with consideration of park values based on the above mentioned park policies, executive orders as well as the Organic Act and enabling legislation.

I very much agree with protection of the night sky in Plan D and F.

Beaches in front of ALL park campgrounds and day use areas should be closed to vehicles when facilities are opened to protect safety, park values and visitor experience. Vehicles could be routed on a marked single lane corridor on the upper beach to pass behind these sites. Frisco campground staff told me campers there were very upset when the park reopened beaches west of Ramp 49 to traffic since this was the only nearby pedestrian beach they could use. I agree with Plan D in that all village beaches will be closed year round to ORVs for the same reason. Parking lots located at ORV ramps do not attract pedestrians. Beaches immediately adjacent to these parking lots should be vehicle-free detouring vehicles in a marked single land corridor on the upper beach to pass behind these sites.

Economics I do not agree that the general economy of the local communities will become weak with year round resource closures regulating access and additional permanent pedestrian-only areas. Other seaside communities in the nation not permitting beach driving still have robust economies. The local economy of Ocracoke grew during the two decades that the northern half of the island was closed to vehicles year round. Frisco and Hatteras grew during the same period when beaches were vehicle-free between Ramp 49 and 55. Sea level rise, storm trends, transportation links and the public's disposable income will have more long lived impacts on the Outer Banks economy. The NPS did not analyze the economic impact of losing visitors who found ORV activity in conflict with their enjoyment of CAHA. As a past CAHA employee, I listened to many such visitor complaints over the years.

I agree with Plan D in that it assigns the highest Preservation Values.

Plan D is the most cost efficient action plan, which would require less NPS resources to implement when compared to other action plans. The aspects I support of Plan F would not add to this cost if incorporated with Plan D as a final plan. Designating additional permanent high quality pedestrian-only beaches would not add to the cost of the final plan.

Correspondence ID: 13774 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Tawes, Angela C
Received: May,11,2010 12:37:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Angela Conner Tawes POST OFFICE BOX 71 BUXTON, NC 27920 Phone 252-995-5711 Fax 252-995-5779
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954

Dear Superintendent Murray:
I am writing in opposition to the ORV DEIS. Alternative F is both oppressive and unfair. Please help residents and visitors by considering the requests of the Coalition for Beach Access.

I disagree with the Pro Active Adaptive Management as set out on page 124 of the DEIS. The Park Service should consider the Pea Island Wildlife Refuge as an appropriate part of the Cape Hatteras Seashore Ecosystem for the propagation of affected species.

The cultural and historical value of our shoreline is undisputable. I am concerned about the failure of the Park Service to recognize this as mandated under Section 106 of the NEPA.

Sincerely,
Angela Conner Tawes

Correspondence ID: 13775 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Norman, Vernon
Received: May,11,2010 12:38:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I agree with the need to protect the piping plover and other wildlife, however the restrictions must not extend to the rental home areas and Off road

vehicles must be given designated areas to use the island. They must be allowed to use the beach in those areas a few hours before and after sunset at a minimum. Many people vacation with their dogs and they should be allowed on the beach, also. Should a restriction be placed on the beach in a rental area, the renters most likely would not return. Their rental choice and price is based on location which may not require driving. A restriction would cause a snowball effect that would affect land values, taxes and monies available to the NPS for all projects in the future. Please keep all restrictions in the current wildlife areas (such as Pea Island). Thank you

Correspondence ID: 13776 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May, 11, 2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
My husband and I have been coming to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore for 15 years. We fell in love with its beauty and the feel of freedom it gave us. We loved it so much that we became a homeowner of a cottage in Frisco. Our dream came true. There are few too many places in driving distance that gives an individual or family such a feeling. However, it looks as if the dream and the feeling is in jeopardy of dying.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must strongly disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have, however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Sincerely,
Mr. & Mrs Wayne Madonna

Correspondence ID: 13777 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Doerr, Patty
Received: May, 11, 2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: May 11, 2010
Via U.S. Mail and Electronic Submission
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Re: Draft Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/ Environmental Impact Statement
Dear Superintendent Murray,
The American Sportfishing Association (ASA) offers the following comments on the National Park Service's (NPS) Draft Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). ASA has serious concerns with the preferred alternative included in the DEIS. The Alternative F, the NPS preferred alternative, is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource conservation and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. Because of the highly unbalanced nature of the preferred alternative, and that important socio-economic information is missing or incomplete, we urge the NPS to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public lands.
ASA is the sportfishing industry's trade association, committed to representing the interests of the entire sportfishing community. We invest in long-term ventures to ensure the industry will remain strong and prosperous as well as safeguard and promote the enduring economic and conservation values of sportfishing in America. ASA also represents the interests of America's 60 million anglers who generate over \$45 billion in retail sales with a \$125 billion impact on the nation's economy creating employment for over one million people.
Dating back to when Cape Hatteras National Seashore (CHNS) was created, the Department of the Interior promised the communities the seashore surrounds that public access for recreation would be maintained and promoted. The unique characteristics of the seashore and its recreational opportunities require the use of off-road vehicles (ORVs) to access remote spits and inlets. While the citizens and businesses of Dare and Ocracoke counties very much understand and support the need for resource protection within the seashore, the NPS's DEIS severely disadvantages reasonable public access while providing overly excessive protections to bird and turtle species. The NPS treats the local communities as if they are located on the outside edges of the seashore, when the reality is the communities are literally surrounded by a national seashore and depend on reasonable access to the seashore for their economic survival. While the NPS states that they are protecting the seashore for future generations, it is sacrificing the livelihoods, enjoyment and culture of the present generation to do so. This is directly contrary to promises made by the NPS upon creation of the unit; in contradiction to Executive Order 13474 that states "that recreational fishing shall be managed as a sustainable activity in national wildlife refuges, national parks? or any other relevant conservation or management areas or activities under any Federal authority?"; and the recent White House initiative to promote recreation in the outdoors.
How to Improve the Preferred Alternative To state that the preferred alternative is the result of the Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee's input is an affront to every member of that committee who promoted ORV and pedestrian access for a variety of activities including surf fishing, kite boarding, kayaking, and bird watching. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee. Alternative F is even more restrictive than the compromise position developed by a subcommittee of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, which received a 19-5 affirmative vote in December 2009. This includes excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures. In addition, the DEIS fails to recognize that the limiting factor in nesting rates is often due to weather and predation. Creating an ORV management plan that assumes ORV interactions are the primary cause of bird disturbances is unfair and inaccurate.
In addition, while science should be the foundation of all resource management decisions, it should only serve as a guiding principle and tool? not be the final result. Scientific information must inform management in such a way that recognizes that humans and their activities, including recreation, are also part of the ecosystem. The seashore must not be managed in order to achieve resource goals that can only be achieved if humans are not present. Unfortunately, that is what the preferred alternatives strives to achieve. This is reflected in large, inflexible buffers that far exceed protections afforded to the federally threatened piping plover under its recovery plan, which are then applied to state managed species that are not considered threatened species.
While the state may list the American oystercatcher and a variety of colonial waterbirds as having special status, in the state of North Carolina that special status is to indicate the state's desire to acquire more robust data on the species, not that these species are on the verge of extinction. They therefore do not warrant protections that exceed those afforded to species federally listed as threatened or endangered. It is very transparent that the Preferred Alternative comes from the direct input of the three organizations suing the NPS for more restrictions to beach access and is far from a consensus position, much less representative of a balanced approach to public policy. To placate current and potential litigants is not sound public policy and only serves to result in injustices borne by the local communities.
In order to restore balance to the DEIS, and therefore regain the trust of the local communities, we highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth by several members of the Cape Hatteras community, who depend on reasonable access to the seashore. This proposal, submitted to the NPS after the conclusion of the Negotiated Rulemaking process, truly builds on the committee discussions. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community, which is vital when the interactions between the local communities and park resources are as intertwined as they are in CHNS. Highlights of this proposal include:
? Resources Closures as outlined below:
Species Breeding Buffer/Nesting Buffer Unfledged Chicks Piping Plover 50 meters 200 meters Wilsons Plover 30 meters 30 meters American Oystercatcher Flush + 15 meters Flush + 15 meters Least Tern 30 meters 30 meters Other Colonial Waterbirds 30 meters 30 meters

? Pedestrian and ORV corridors or bypasses provided through, around or below the high tide line in all SMAs during the entire breeding and nesting seasons (within guidelines) to maintain access. ? NPS should aggressively pursue the adaptive management initiatives identified in the DEIS with the object to improve its success with both resources protection and visitor access. The initiatives identified include vegetation management, habitat management, enhanced predator management, colonial waterbird social attraction, piping plover check fledge rate, piping plover chick buffer distance and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. ? Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS. ? A proactive Turtle Night Nest Watch Program to allow for maximum nest protection and reasonable ORV and pedestrian access at night. ? Keep the beach open at night in key areas (e.g., Cape Point and Oregon Inlet) where access for popular activities such as fishing and night sky watching can be accommodated ? Ten-meter square turtle protection areas. ? Permit camp fires and leashed pets throughout the park, as to not advantage beach front home owners.

Socio-Economic Analysis ASA is especially concerned that the NPS has not fulfilled its duty in conducting an adequate socio-economic analysis. Unfortunately, the entire Socioeconomic Impacts section of the DEIS was rushed and prematurely released, resulting in estimated impacts for the preferred alternative that are based on subjective reasoning, more than the other alternatives. For example, a survey was conducted into potential business impacts, but it is not yet completed and was not included in the DEIS's results (as stated on p. 566). Only parts of the business survey were applied in the DEIS, and it states the business survey results will be included in the final plan/EIS. This is unacceptable because reviewers are not provided full and objective information upon which to make their comments.

In addition, page 570-571 talks about a survey of vehicle use on the beach. The data were not ready for use in the draft EIS. Given that the socioeconomic impact analysis is incomplete, ASA is very concerned that not only is NPS making decisions that affect the economic future of these small businesses, but the public will not have a chance to comment or review the final results of the analysis. This is once again an affront to the local businesses and communities that were promised a fair hearing in the development of this plan and who have invested untold hours in a process they believed would be objective and based on complete data.

The DEIS states that small businesses, which make up 95-98% of business in CHNS, would be impacted more than others by the closures. According to the severity definitions given on pages 571 & 572, all of the alternatives presented in Table 61 (page 562) would place "major" impacts on the seashore villages. Footnotes throughout the tables in the pages describing each alternative tell us that about half or more of the impacts from closures will accrue to the seashore villages.

In addition, most socioeconomic analyses conducted by federal resource management agencies require "use values" (angling, beach driving, etc) and "non-use values" (existence of birds, etc.) be considered when setting public policy or damage awards. Federal natural resource damage policy (NRDA) and others require consideration of use and non-use values. The DEIS does not include use values, yet non-use values are included starting in the first paragraph and appear to be based completely on assumptions and personal opinions. There are no descriptions of how these statements were developed. Recognizing the failure to include use values, which measure net impacts to anglers and other beach users, the non-use preservation values should be rejected.

The third paragraph on page 568 is a concern. It states that NPS visitation statistics cannot support any claims that the consent decree impacted visitation. It says: "? the information does not support projections of decreases in visitation?" This is misleading. The NPS asserts that state visitation was down in 2008 statewide. However, fishing license data show sportfishing license sales in North Carolina statewide were up 13-15% (according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.) We know that many factors combine to drive visitation levels, but without the 2007 consent decree, 2008 visitation levels could have been even higher. No one knows for sure. In addition, the analysis does not use data from the first full year of the consent decree (2009.) Many 2008 visitors were either unaware of the scope and breadth of the consent decree's beach closures or had already made reservations for that travel year. Therefore, ASA disagrees with the impression given by the Draft EIS's comment quoted here.

The impacts of the various proposed alternatives beginning on page 573 cannot be accepted or even considered at this time, as the DEIS earlier stated that more data will be released soon. And when that happens, NPS will either confirm or update the DEIS's estimates. To release estimates now may falsely bias readers, which can lead to harmful decisions. It is poor public policy to release draft data in a public process such as this. The DEIS also reported that local businesses expressed concern about the data being applied to estimate future impacts, but that still occurs starting on page 573. Conclusion The level of trust the local communities in CHNS have for the NPS has severely declined since the start of the Negotiated Rulemaking Process. There has been no public outreach by the NPS to the communities since the consent decree was instituted, and the seashore is being managed sixty miles away in Manteo, NC. The deep mistrust is not founded in the resources, but in the notion that the NPS seems determined to cripple a struggling local economy and a way of life. ASA strongly urges the NPS to complete essential data needs and then re-issue the document with the appropriate and necessary changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public lands.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Patty Doerr Ocean Resource Policy Director

cc: Mr. Jon Jarvis, Director, National Park Service Mr. Will Shaffroth, Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks The Honorable Richard Burr, U.S. Senate The Honorable Kay R. Hagen, U.S. Senate The Honorable Walter B. Jones, U.S. House of Representatives

Correspondence ID: 13778 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Francis, James V
Received: May,11,2010 12:42:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the prohibition of pets, pg.136 during breeding season. I own a rental cottage in Salvo that allows pets. Prohibition of pets during breeding season will have adverse affects on my ability to rent my cottage resulting in loss of income for myself, loss of income for Salvo, and loss of income for the State of North Carolina.

Correspondence ID: 13779 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Dufala, Allen
Received: May,11,2010 12:45:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Mike Murray Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore
I am a home owner on Hatteras Island
I hail from Pittsburgh, Pa. and it was the mellons,scaifes, and phips who were instrumental in the national seashore on hatteras island.
I think the park service must review reconsider and determine how to provide for both human and "animal" needs related to the national seashore.
I would gladly work with your organization to provide solution not band-aid to the current issues on Hatteras Island
Allen Dufala
412 741 3825

Correspondence ID: 13780 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 12:45:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: No ORV on Hatteras - that is absolutely unacceptable. My family has visited the Outer Banks several times, and if you choose to ruin it with letting motorized vehicles in, we will not visit again. Such a fragile habitat needs more respectful treatment.

Correspondence ID: 13781 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Ackley, Miriam C

Received: May,11,2010 12:47:37

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: In July of 1957, my parents and I packed up our camper and headed to the first campground at Oregon Inlet in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It was quite primitive back then, but we spent a week learning to catch blue crabs, fish for blues, and enjoy the utter beauty of the beach. For the next 52 years, I have spent my summer vacations enjoying the National Seashore. The memories I have are of nothing but joy. Once the campground at the lighthouse was completed we camped there. I remember attending every program sponsored by the Park Service: walks with the Rangers, campfires on the beach, slide shows in the amphitheater. We learned what to touch and what not to touch. "Take only inspiration, leave only footprints" was the motto. In 2003, my husband and I purchased a small piece of property (paradise)in Hatteras Village. We do not rent our property so we are frequent visitors. Most mornings I walk the beach along MP70. I pick up trash, report injured wildlife, and have been "first on the scene" of a fresh turtle nest. I watch other families on their first visit and answer questions from excited children who have never seen a a skate egg case or a Portuguese Man of War. I teach them the names of all the birds: willets, sanderlings, gulls, egrets, etc. Plan F would prohibit me from all these activities that I love. I can't imagine being restricted from the beautiful shore. No kite boarding, surfing, fishing, or beach combing. Economically, this plan would turn Hatteras and Ocracoke villages into another Portsmouth Island. Property value would tumble, as would assessments, leading to reduced tax collections. Businesses would fail. Tourism is the lifeblood of the Island. There surly has to be a better way to manage wildlife. As I mentioned, our property is not rental so my position is not driven from a selfish economic view point. I respectfully request that you not go with plan F and I thank you for the opportunity you have given me to comment.

Correspondence ID: 13782 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 12:47:49

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please reconsider the closures. Of all the miles of coastline within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area, leaving open areas around the existing ramps will still allow more than enough breeding areas for birds and turtles. Thank you for your consideration.

Correspondence ID: 13783 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: N/A, N/A

Received: May,11,2010 12:48:06

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The Deis strongly implies that, prior to the consent decree, nesting birds and turtles were simply unprotected. The implication allows the DEIS to use the consent decree as a starting point for nest protection and ORV management, when, in fact, beaches had been closed and ORV access limited by local NPS management well before the lawyers and judges starting making closure decisions. When future closure policy analyses start at the beginning, a far different picture emerges rendering the banning of pets, 1000 m of closure per bird, the ignoring of historical/cultural issues, the denial of the existence of a 12 mile wildlife preserve or of birds nesting on predator free out islands, the unwillingness to open corridors and apply pro-active management techniques (move nests, make areas not valued by recreation more attractive to nesting birds)all the more obviously irresponsible.

Correspondence ID: 13784 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 12:48:11

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Ladies and Gentlemen,
I've been fortunate enough to enjoy my vacation each year on the Outer Banks, specifically, South Nags Head since 1988. And while I'm in total favor of protecting and preserving the seashore and it's inhabitants, I believe your proposal for pet restrictions, in order to preserve the nesting and breeding of birds, is both unnecessary and potentially harmful to the economic stability of the region.
I have yet, in all my years, seen pets running loose or being unattended where they would impdede on either the continuation of wildlife or destroy their natural surroundings. We personally do not bring our pet(s) to the beach, but have considered it many times. However, having mostly long haired dogs, we felt that the didn't want to have the beach at home with us the rest of the year, so we didn't bring them. But, at least that choice was open to us to make. If you impose the pet restrictions that are being discussed, you will autmoatically eliminate a segment of your tourist population, maybe as much as 30% of them. And not that it's the only reason, but I've noticed more and more vacancies over the past few years, so the area may not be on the upside of tourism growth at this point anyway.
I don't believe regulations are necessary regarding pets and highly doubt a significant problem exists at all, but I certainly do not agree with banning them all for the period you are considering. Please do not get caught up in runaway governement or over regulation for what may not be an issue or problem at all, but could have devastating effects on the community.

Correspondence ID: 13785 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 12:48:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I disagree with the NPS plan to close our beaches. As a long time resident I strongly believe that a vast majority of our tourism is due to the availability of our beaches. When planning a vacation people do not come to see the largest mall in the United States, they do not come to see the largest aquarium, they come to spend time on the most beautiful beaches in the United States. I believe closing our beaches or restricting them to the point of disinterest to tourism will send our economy into a tumultuous tail spin that we will not recover from. The draw of our beaches bring people back year after year, its a consistent form of income, although tourism may have been up the past two years it will not be the same visitors year after year if they find that they cannot use the natural resources that makes this island what it is. A bird is being protected to kill a species of greater importance. KEEP OUR BEACHES OPEN TO ALL AT ALL TIMES

Correspondence ID: 13786 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: hoffman, steve l

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a kiteboarder from California who is planning on visiting The Outer Banks, North Carolina
It has been brought to the attention that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks, North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wild life observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected thus understand certain steps maybe 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 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 great wilderness.
The proposed plans affect many groups of people ? we urge that you keep in mind the desires of all parties involved, as a significant change in the way

the Outer Banks environmental situation is handled may result in a significant decrease in utilization of the land. Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Please read our "Field Report" section of our Forums page to gauge how many people travel to the Outer Banks annually; these people help support the environment, local business and the local economy. Kiteboarding is an environmentally friendly (quiet, no pollution and very little, if any, waste) activity which we are proud to partake in. We respect the environment and look forward to participating with those individuals charged with changing the way the current environmental issues are handled. We look forward to your consideration and hope to continue our frequent and ecologically friendly use of this wonderful destination. thank you Steve Hoffman 312 Nashville av #5 Huntington beach, ca 92648

Correspondence ID: 13787 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954

Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.

I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.

Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13788 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within this document. I have, however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Janie Koon 3133 Hunters Chase Dr. #604 Virginia Beach, Virginia 23452

Correspondence ID: 13789 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 12:52:16

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: 13790 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. I would prefer to see no ORV use allowed at all in the Park, but I recognize that there needs to be a balance of uses within the Park. However, the Park has identified Alternative F as the preferred option, which does NOT balance the uses. It is skewed towards one vocal group, which is not a reasonable alternative at all.

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

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

* Put Natural Resources First. The Park was created to protect our State's natural resources, the protection of those natural resources should come first: any recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife in order to allow for successful breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information.

Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13791 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me. I am a bird watcher and a surfer and feel motorized traffic has been the priority on Cape Hatteras National Seashore to the detriment of wildlife. In view of the Gulf spill and trends in general I believe more should be done in all our national parks to restore and enhance natural values. Please put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles. Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13792 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
The 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule-making process 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: 13793 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 12:53:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am an Outer Banks native, body boarder, surf artist and member of Surfrider Foundation, who was brought up to love and respect my environment. I have roamed the beaches and dunes from Hatteras to Corolla since I was a kid. I've spent many a day body boarding up and down the Outer Banks, some places only accessible by four wheel drive. Some of those times have been the best in my life. And now I can share that with my kids by taking them. Being an OBX native I have worked many places here...none of us could make a living here if it weren't for our visitors to the Outer Banks. You close the beaches and it is a death sentence to those in the areas effected by the beach closures. They come here for beautiful wide open beaches, the best surf on the East Coast, and great fishing among other things. OUR BEACHES...for whatever recreational past time our visitors enjoy, it revolves around the ocean and our beaches. I understand the concern for our wildlife, but closing the beaches to everyone, be it by foot or in a vehicle isn't the answer. I think requiring beach drivers to get some sort of permit would be very helpful. In all my years I have NEVER seen anyone hurt our wildlife intentionally. I've seen beach drivers who endanger other drivers. Quite simply the birds WILL nest elsewhere. They can, they will and they do. The smart ones want nothing to do with us, so they nest in more secluded areas, the islands in the sounds are filled with nesting birds. I believe more research is needed and by someone NOT affiliated with either side. Seems like everyone is going by what the Audobon Society specialists dicat. And this is done without thought to those of us trying to earn a living in already hurting economy. Seriously, would you close all of Yellowstone to the public? Let's close access to the Great Smokey Mtns. OUR WHOLE LIVELIHOOD REVOLVES AROUND OUR OCEAN AND OUR BEACHES. Every last shop owner, restaurant, rental agency, builder, ETC, caterS to our visitors in one form or another and they are here to GO TO THE BEACH. Yes, even places like Cape Hatteras Light, Ocracoke Light, Bodie Island Lighthouse, The Lost Colony, RIFP and even the Wright Brothers Memorial could be effected. Why? The tourist, fishermen and surfers will simply go somewhere else. Why visit those landmarks if they can't go to the main one... Outer Banks Beaches. I could go on but hopefully you will see where I am coming from. I admit my family doesn't go to anywhere south of Nags Head to go surfing or fishing like we used to because of the beach closures. What's the point when you want to go to the beach but it's been closed. Why take the drive. We used to make a weekend of it all the time,surf, shop, dine in local restaurants, and visit the Cape Hatteras lighthouse, etc. Not any more. The sad thing is Hatteras Island is a HUGE east coast draw when it comes to surfing, windsurfing, kiteboarding, and fishing. And the local people have suffered because people are vacationing somewhere else where the beaches are not closed and they can enjoy their favorite recreational pastimes. I think more research needs to be done by an OUTSIDE 3RD PARTY and only close a few areas for nesting birds while conducting the extra research. They need to research the local economy and the possible side effects of beach closures. And they need to do a more detailed research of the wildlife and all of the surrounding areas they live in,etc. Closing the beach to all is nothing more than a death sentence to those of us living in Dare and Hyde County. And what a waste to close them, when we have such a wonderful coastline to share with the rest of the world.

Correspondence ID: 13794 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 12:53:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly disagree with the stated proposal in regards to the new planning for ORV use on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. when the park service bought the land from my family generations ago it was stated that as long as the families and island were there that the land would always be free to use as a hunting and recreation area with little to no regulations to hinder the use of our natural resources. what is the point of banning humans from using land that they once owned and were promised continual use of? i feel as though our economy will suffer greatly in the event that the beaches are closed, and in all honesty what else is there to do around here other than enjoy the beach? it will kill this island and ruin the lives of those who have been here since the beginning, and those who have chosen to call this beautiful place home for years and years to come. KEEP OUR BEACHES OPEN TO ALL AT ALL TIMES

Correspondence ID:	13795	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 12:54:18						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Driving motor vehicles, with the exception of emergency vehicles, on beaches should be banned. There is no good reason to drive on the beach except for the fun of driving on the beach. There are other methods of travel suitable for the beach, including walking, running, biking. Driving on the beach pollutes the area. Emissions, oil leaks, anti-freeze, airconditioning run off all sink in the sand and eventually enter the ocean. The noise of the vehicles scares wildlife from its natural habitat (turtles, crabs, birds . . .) Rotten drivers run over the creatures. Some of these creatures are endangered.						
Correspondence ID:	13796	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Seavey, Paul A						
Received:	May,11,2010 12:54:37						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	To whom it may concern. I am writing this with deep concern that the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore may become closed to vehicles and or pedestrians. My family has been vacationing in the Cape Hatteras area for over 20 years. We enjoy the beautiful ocean and beaches and the way of life. I have traveled to many of our National treasures and while I feel that we need to preserve and protect them I would hope that you keep in mind that they are for all of us to enjoy. My daughter has learned so much on the shores of Hatteras in regard to the oceans, wildlife and the need to respect and protect nature. But to what extreme? To the point that we can not even enjoy what nature has to offer. I hope not. I also find it ironic that most of this land was actually donated from local people as to insure future generations enjoyment. While I can not comment directly I am sure that the impact that this will have on the local economy would be devastating. We have a ski area up here in New England and the former owner once said, "you should not profit from the mountains, lakes and rivers etc. They are here for us to enjoy." Well it may not be a profit issue but it seems to me that all of us should be able to enjoy our beautiful shoreline in Cape Hatteras. PLEASE KEEP THE BEACHES OPEN. It is so important to so many people. Thank you, Paul Seavey						
Correspondence ID:	13797	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Cotten, Robert G						
Received:	May,11,2010 12:54:39						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I think access to beach driving on Hatteras Island should still be open to the public. I have been going to Hatteras Island for over 15yrs and I have never seen a problem with people messing with the wild life parts of the beach, or damaageing the beach in anyway. The limited access that is out there now I belive is doing more harm because now instead of there being more area to spread out over the beach you now have all the trucks parked in one spot which in turn causes more damage to the beach because you now have a more concentrated area of driving. I belive protection of the wild life is important but it has gotten to the point where we can not enjoy the OBX has we have been able to in the past and in return could hurt the local business. OBX is like no place on the east coast the beaches are wild open and not a mass of people like you find at other beaches on the east coast the fishing is better than other places and it brings you back to a more simple time. Cutting beach access would limit those who use it to drive to the "Point" park the truck and "wet a hook" and just relax and get a way from the life of cell phones, email, meetings, and all the norm's of our fast paced life. So please find a way to keep our beach access and protect the local wildlife cause the old system was working just fine.						
Correspondence ID:	13798	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 12:55:07						
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:	13799	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 12:55:25						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Sirs: The Park Service proposals are an injustice to the original formation of The Cape Hatteras National Seashore, intended for human RECREATIONAL use. The lack of a local business polled economic review is unbelievable. The park must remain open for recreational use by people on foot and in vehicles at all times. The buffers are ridiculous and not scientifically supported. Peer review scientific data is required for any decisions of this magnitude. The parks adjacent spoil islands need to be included for analysis. Furthermore CHNS is not the last bastion of sustainability for the piping plover. CPHNS is only the southern range and the species is located in Canada and the US Northeast and in the US Midwest. The endangered species in CHNS is the hunman being! Harry T. Branch						
Correspondence ID:	13800	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 12:56:01						

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I support reasonable accommodations for endangered species, however, all of the current proposed alternatives by the NPS (which I have reviewed) and the coalition of well-funded of environmental groups have gone above and beyond the requirements of the law to the detriment of the human population. The decision about which species qualify for protection under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) has already been made by Congress and The ban against beach driving should not be expanded to species that are not within the purview of that law. In general I support 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.

Impacts to Fall Disproportionately on Poor and Vulnerable Portions of the Population The proposed restrictions on beach driving, pedestrian and pet access will have a number of deleterious effects, including by not limited to, turning Hatteras National Seashore into a group of "haves" and "have-nots" and the effects will fall most heavily on the most vulnerable populations ? the handicapped, elderly, less healthy persons, families with small children and the less affluent. This trend is being resisted all over the world as in the international arena, the attempts to balance the traditional uses of the beach (or other protected areas) with the true needs of wildlife. Many of the people who live on Hatteras Island full time are hanging on by their fingernails, dependent on a tourist economy that has been devastated by national recession as well as the impacts of lack of beach access. Those who can afford to rent the oceanfront castles-by-the-sea, who will have easy access to the beach and the rest of the population who will have limited access as there are vastly insufficient parking lots for the beach users if they cannot drive on the beach. As an aside, there is a lack of knowledge/compliance by those beach users concerning the impacts of leaving chairs, volleyball nets and other beach toys on the beach overnight on turtle nesting. There are a number of less drastic measures that can be taken to reach the goal of reaching a proper balance between beach access and endangered species. Lack of Scientific Consensus/Study Supporting the Proposed Restrictions on Beach Access It is very disappointing that the NPS did not undertake a true study of the effects of beach driving on the species covered by the ESA. The old study has not been updated, nor was its purpose the use to which it is being put, so it is woefully inadequate. For example, it does not consider all the habitat available to the endangered species, such as dredge islands. Moreover, I have been reading the or preNPS weekly resource management reports (I subscribe to the NPS email list) for the past year and a half. I have yet to see a report that an ORV has damaged a nest or chick. The proposed buffer areas are not supported by sound science. And the reports indicate that many (if not most) of the chicks fail to mature due to storms or predation. I believe that better results for the endangered birds could be achieved by more aggressive predator control, especially non-native predators such as feral cats. Selecting to preserve one species over another is a much closer call when the other predators are also native. For turtles, why are more aggressive steps not taken to preserve their nests from storms, etc. There seems to be a very good argument for moving the nests up closer to the dunes (and out of the reach of weather driven problems as well out of the ORV corridors. I am a non-resident property owner whose house is in a rental program -- we have seen a decrease in rentals since the ORV restrictions have gone into effect.

Correspondence ID: 13801 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Robinson, Dennis W

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954

Dear Superintendent Murray, I am writing you today to make formal comments on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement, specifically Alternative F, created by the National Park Service with input from the negotiated rulemaking advisory Committee. I wish to thank the National Park Service for an opportunity to comment on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore ORV Management Plan DEIS. As a concerned Hatteras Island citizen and president of the Hatteras Village Civic Association, I feel it is my professional and civic duty to make timely comment on a matter that affects millions of citizens who wish to visit and have access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

Comment 1:

Tourists are the lifeblood of the local economy. They stay at motels and rental houses. They eat at the restaurants and buy food from the grocery stores. They put gas in their vehicles. They support the local shops by getting bait and tackle, bathing suits, surf boards and books. They buy souvenirs, local art and T-Shirts to remember their time here on the islands. During the summer, it was difficult to find a place to stay if you didn't have a reservation and there were always long waits to get into restaurants. For decades, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area was immune from recession including the fallout from Sept. 11, 2001. Economic downturns that would cripple the national economy tended to give a boost to the Hatteras economy because people were inclined to go to Hatteras for inexpensive, short-distance vacations.

The Consent Decree has taken a heavy toll on the local economy. Without sensible beach access, there is no reason for tourists to come here. Since 2008, successful businesses that are older than the park itself have started to fail.

The Consent Decree and the resulting soft economy happened months before the nation began suffering from the recession. When the stock market plunged in September 2008, the Hatteras and Ocracoke economies were rebounding because the beaches reopened the month before. Businesses located near closed ramps to the beach struggled while businesses near an open ramp blossomed, even if they were just a few miles apart. Previous bird protection plans, specifically the Interim Protected Species Management Plan, had no effect on the local business.

Alternative F will significantly change the economy and unique culture of the Outer Banks. The DEIS has failed to properly assess those changes. The Economic Impact Analysis found the DEIS by its own admission is incomplete. How can I comment on an incomplete document? The Economic analysis is structured in such a manner that it fails to address full costs?direct costs, indirect costs, lost opportunity costs, costs of future liability, and hidden costs.

The Economic Analysis fails to recognize that the national seashore environment is a unique form of capital that serves the local economy, and in turn the health and well being of citizens and families that depend of that economy. Access to the seashore is essential for family business operations on the Outer Banks. In our family business, vacation rentals, the spring rental season has been decimated by the beach closures brought about by the consent decree. The demographics of the spring guests have been traditionally fishermen and they are unwilling to risk sending money on a vacation when the beach access is so untenable.

The cost to society and the local communities under the restrictive consent decree has now been extended indefinitely into Alternative F. Economic losses in millions of dollars have occurred to island businesses especially motels, campgrounds, restaurants and tackle shops. The full costs of Alternative F are very much understated in the DEIS. Annual economic losses under the consent decree are already in excess of those estimated by Research Triangle Institute.

It is my understanding that the Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce, on behalf of its more than 1,000 members with businesses in Dare, Hyde and Currituck counties, has gone on record as vehemently disagreeing with the validity of the economic impact analysis included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for proposed new rules for access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

This group of professional business owners states unequivocally states "Not only does the analysis not adequately convey the economic impact of the proposed Alternative F, it fails to address any of the alternatives listed in the DEIS. The data is incomplete, misleading and the statements of what are supposed to be facts are without sound basis."

Comment 2:

If I understand the document correctly, it would appear as if the DEIS proposes to close the beaches at Hatteras Inlet, both the South Tip of Hatteras Island and the North tip of Ocracoke Island permanently and year-round. Aside from the fact that such a closure would forever alter the traditional uses of these areas, such a closure has already and will impact the public safety of mariners traversing the inlet.

On Saturday, May 1st 2010, a local inshore charter boat from Hatteras Village overturned in Hatteras Inlet. There were 6 occupants of the boat, all family members, 3 children and 3 adults. The captain was a professional charter captain. They spent 4 hours in the water awaiting rescue. They could have been seen from the beach, had it been open but instead had to wait until the offshore charter fleet was returning in late day for any hopes of being rescued. One of the group died as a result.

Comment 3:

It appears as if the preferred alternative prohibits pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages. This means no pets

in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, sound front, foot trails, and park maintained roads from March 15 ?July 31. If this is a correct interpretation, we are opposed. We support the previous leash law (all pets must be on a leash 6 feet or less in length).

Regards,
Dennis Robinson President Hatteras Village Civic Association

Correspondence ID: 13802 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Cantwell, Christine
Received: May,11,2010 12:56:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have lived year round in Frisco, NC since 2002 and been a frequent visitor to the seashore for several years prior to moving my full time residence here. I have reviewed the DEIS, but I think that The Coalition for Beach Access has a more common sense approach and proposal. Specifically, I disagree with the following points. Economic Impacts: Page 270(Part2of2) and Page 144)Table detailing impacts in Chapter 2) Considering any data for Dare County that includes the northern beaches (Nags Head north to Duck) skews the data. While visitors to those areas, may make day or short overnight trips to Hatteras Island and Ocracoke, the greatest source of our income comes from visitors direct to the island. I think the economic impact will be very adverse if Alternative F is implemented as it is now written. I am a small business owner and I work part time in a retail gallery/gift store. I can speak from personal experience in saying that the restrictions of the the Consent Decree over the past years has tremendously and adversely impacted both my business and what I have observed as an employee. My sales last year were the worst ever and resulted in an overall loss of income. Given that Alternative F provides even more restrictions than the Consent Decree, I have to conclude that the economic effects will be significantly adverse. Pets: Page 187 (Table 8 in Part 1 of 2) I disagree with your recommendation of prohibiting pets in any SMA from Mar 15-July 31(or 2 weeks after all shorebird breeding activity has ceased & all chicks have fledged). This seems excessive. I enjoy going to the beach with pets and most of our friends have dogs that enjoy the beach as well. Pets should be allowed in any area of the seashore that is open to ORVs/Pedestrians as long as they are on a 6 foot leash.

Correspondence ID: 13803 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 12:56:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this note as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the national Park DEIS I must disagree with all the six alternatives.
I believe the Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement by far succeeds in proving the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please put people back into the managemnt of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Thank you for your consideration.
B. Greller Baltimore, Maryland 21212

Correspondence ID: 13804 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Blakney, Harold
Received: May,11,2010 12:57:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the NPS statement made on page 210 stating the adverse affects of pedestrians and ORVs on the piping plovers. The statement proclaiming that "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk" in unfounded as there have not been any plover deaths attributed to human or ORV intervention. Not only is this a flawed statement, the DEIS does not include the known period before the consent decree (under the Interim Plan) where no plovers have been killed by pedestrians or ORVs. What has been neglected and erroneously miscalculated are the overall risks to plovers, which are known to be predators and weather events (storms). In order to achieve the greatest return on the effort expended with the least affect on the society and economics of the Island community, the greatest risks should be considered and addressed first with species relocation and predator deterrents.

Correspondence ID: 13805 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 12:57:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: ? Desirable areas require vehicular access due to their distance from the highway and parking areas.
? Equipment needed for recreating in area of beach accessed cannot be easily carried on foot. (Beach toys, umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing equipment, water-sports boards, cameras and binoculars
? The principle activity aided by ORV access on these beaches is best described as multiple-use. This concept has developed over many years of public experience without resource conflict. ORV operation provides the flexibility to respond to the rapid weather and ecological changes that occur along these shifting strands of sand. Weather, wind, and waves often dictate where and when a particular recreation will be practiced. The proposal also gives consideration to year-round and seasonal pedestrian use. Seasonal ORV use is contemplated only in non-peak visitation times of the year in front of villages. Year-round pedestrian closures are contemplated where pedestrian visitors can easily access and use beaches free of ORV traffic.
? Visitors with disabilities and families with infants and young children must travel unwalkable distances to enjoy beach activities including swimming in safe areas at tidal pools, on the sound side of inlets and the west side of Cape Point.
? Elderly and health disadvantaged are able to enjoy beach activities they otherwise could not access.

Correspondence ID: 13806 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Jorlett, Joel
Received: May,11,2010 12:58:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We disagree with all of the proposed alternatives [A through F] put forth in the draft Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement for the primary reasons below. We do agree that the park does need a Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan as set forth by the Presidential Executive Order. We feel very strongly that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore under direction of Superintendent Murray has written a plan that targets the off-road vehicle users of the park by basing the proposed plan on a document [Consent Decree] written by special interest groups. CAHA is a 'national seashore" not a wildlife refuge.
Our comments are not referenced to specific sections/paragraphs or pages of the document because they apply to issues used throughout the draft plan. The size of buffers [bird enclosures] have no known scientific basis. Other National Parks have enclosures for the piping plover of 200 meters but Cape Hatteras National Seashore [CHNS] has established enclosures of 1000 meters.
Do not support establishing enclosures for bird that are not threatened or endangered.
No flexibility within CAHA...nesting areas on the inland side of dunes result in closures on the ocean side of the dunes. Are chicks really going to walk over the dunes?
Allowing formerly open areas of the park to become overgrown with vegetation. This enables predators to approach nesting birds undetected. Areas that

once provided nesting areas are currently not available or attractive to nesting birds thus forcing them to nest in areas closer to the shoreline making them more likely to be damaged/lost to storm/tidal flooding. CAHA statistics show that the vast majority of losses [83%] are caused by mother nature not to humans. Not providing for draining of flooded areas in the park resulting in loss of acreage for wildlife.

Closures from the dune line to the ocean without access corridors yet birds have nested next to Highway 12 with no apparent impact on nesting.

Counting miles of beach open but accessible only by water...this is misleading to the general public.

This is a national "recreational" seashore not a wildlife refuge but actions of the CAHA would lead one to believe otherwise.

It is apparent to us that every year more and more acres of the parks are being closed year round to use by visitors...not all visitors to the park just want to use the ocean beach areas.

In regard to the park area west of the ferry dock...numerous sound access points were lost during past storms but the CAHA has taken no action to reopen or establish access points to the sound.

It is clear to us and many other users of the park that numerous acres of the park are lost each year to administrative actions or inactions...these losses are exclusive of action taken by mother nature!

No mention of provisions afforded individual with disabilities. CAHA has done very little if anything to provide for the disabled over the years. We believe that the American with Disabilities Act should be taken into consideration in all actions taken by the CHNS. You are quick to protect birds not threatened or endangered but what about providing for the disabled?

On the CAHA NPS website in the "Nature and Science" section there is a reference to the piping plover as "endangered" when in fact the bird is "threatened". Statements like this on the official NPS website are misleading to the general public. Just how much more false and misleading information is in documents published by the NPS relating to the situation at hand? We assumed that the credit to "Sidney Maddox" was for the picture of the piping plover and hopefully not the statement that the bird is endangered.

As stated we feel protection of threatened or endangered birds is needed but do no support actions taken to protect birds that are of interest - of interest to whom?

We believe that both humans and birds/animals can use the park jointly but feel that the humans are not getting a fair shake...the park was established as a "National Recreational Seashore" and not a wildlife refuge.

Respectfully, Joel and Elizabeth B. Jorlett

Correspondence ID: 13807 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Rylander, Jason C
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: American Bird Conservancy ? Ascutney Mountain Audubon Society ? Center for Biological Diversity ? Conservation International ? Delaware Valley Ornithological Club ? Delmarva Ornithological Society ? Sacharuna Foundation ? Salem Audubon Society ? Saving Birds Thru Habitat ? Wildlands CPR

May 11, 2010

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

Dear Superintendent Murray:

These comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-road Vehicle Management Plan ("DEIS") are submitted by American Bird Conservancy, Ascutney Mountain Audubon Society, Center for Biological Diversity, Conservation International, Delaware Valley Ornithological Club, Delmarva Ornithological Society, Sacharuna Foundation, Salem Audubon Society, Saving Birds Thru Habitat, and Wildlands CPR.

Collectively, these organizations represent approximately 300,000 members and supporters with an interest in protecting America's wildlife heritage and the public lands and natural resources on which they depend.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore ("Seashore") attracts 2.2 million visitors annually to enjoy its beaches, lighthouses, and adjacent coastal waters. The Seashore also provides habitat to many species of wildlife, including some that are federally or state-listed. For example, the Seashore is a nesting ground for threatened piping plovers, threatened green sea turtles and, occasionally, endangered leatherback sea turtles. Loggerhead turtles, which also nest at Cape Hatteras, have been proposed by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service to be listed as endangered. In addition, the Seashore provides important nesting or migratory habitats for various species of shorebirds and colonial waterbirds, including the American oystercatcher, least tern, gull-billed tern, and red knot, which itself is a candidate for federal listing under the Endangered Species Act.

Although President Nixon directed all national parks and seashores to develop off-road vehicle ("ORV") management plans in 1972, Cape Hatteras National Seashore remains out of compliance. Over time, the Park Service's lax regulation of vehicles on the beach and inadequate protection of natural resources has contributed to significant documented declines in the nesting wildlife at the Seashore. In 2008, a temporary plan to manage the impact of ORV use was put in place by a consent decree settlement of a lawsuit. Breeding birds and sea turtles have begun to rebound under this temporary management, which has continued to allow ORV use of the beaches consistent with wildlife protection, and overall visitation to the Seashore has increased.

We recommend the National Park Service adopt and implement a final ORV management plan for the Seashore that responds to the following guiding principles and comments on the environmental analysis in the DEIS. We believe these recommended measures are necessary for NPS to meet its legal mandates to conserve and protect the natural resources of the Seashore, leave them unimpaired for future generations, and provide an appropriate balance between continued ORV use and other public uses of the Seashore.

? The final ORV management plan should be based on environmentally-preferred Alternative D in the DEIS, modified to allow increased pedestrian access subject to standard resource closures and a 100-foot wide ORV access corridor to Cape Point and South Point subject to standard resource closures to protect shorebirds and waterbirds once breeding behavior is observed.

? The final EIS should include a true "no action" alternative of no ORV use on Seashore which will provide an appropriate baseline for assessing and evaluating environmental impacts of the action alternatives.

? Management measures to protect wildlife must be based on the best scientific information available which is presented to NPS in the peer-reviewed recommendations and report from the U.S. Geological Survey scientists.

? As recommended by the USGS scientists and the 2008 Loggerhead Sea Turtle Recovery Plan, night driving must be prohibited during the sea turtle nesting season to protect and recover these threatened and endangered species.

? The final plan must provide additional protections to migratory and wintering shorebirds which can be achieved through year round ORV closures of critical areas.

? The final management plan should set species recovery goals for the Seashore based on an analysis of carrying capacity and consistent with recovery plans for threatened and endangered species. These goals should replace artificially low desired future conditions for threatened, state listed, and special status species for the Seashore with higher targets that are consistent with how these species can recover at the Seashore over the short and long term if they were properly managed.

? The preferred ORV management plan provides inadequate areas where ORV use is prohibited year round for use and enjoyment by pedestrians and other visitors. The Park Service's preferred plan would allow continued driving on 52 of 68 miles of the Seashore.

? ORV management should include a permit system with a mandatory education component. In administering permits, the Park Service should also sharply reduce its recommended ORV carrying capacity of 260 vehicles/mile allowed in alternative F, which would result in over 13,500 ORVs being able to use the Seashore beaches at certain times of the year, to a level that will better protect resources and reduce pedestrian/ORV conflicts.

Unregulated beach driving within critical natural resource areas has interfered with nesting success, undermined species recovery, and undermined the visitor experience at the Seashore, in violation of the Endangered Species Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, two Presidential Executive Orders, the Seashore's own Organic Act, and National Park Service regulations. Moreover, Cape Hatteras's policies have long stood in marked contrast to those of other national seashores, including Cape Cod, Fire Island, and Assateague Island, which have final rules or other management plans in place to address ORV use.

We appreciate that the National Park Service at last appears ready to manage ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Its preferred alternative, however, falls short of what's legally and biologically required to conserve the Seashore's wildlife and natural resources unimpaired for future generations. We strongly urge the Park Service to adopt as its final ORV management plan the modified Alternative D as described above.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Darin C. Schroeder Vice President of Conservation Advocacy American Bird Conservancy 1731 Connecticut Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20009
(202) 234-7181 x.209 www.abcbirds.org

Wally Elton Conservation Chairman Ascutney Mountain Audubon Society PO Box 191 Springfield, VT 05156

Kieran Suckling Executive Director Center for Biological Diversity POB 710, Tucson AZ 85702 (520) 623-5252 x.305 www.biologicaldiversity.org

Bruce Beehler Senior Research Scientist Division of Science and Knowledge Conservation International Arlington, VA 22202

Philip Witmer Conservation Chair Delaware Valley Ornithological Club 125 Hathaway Lane Havertown, PA 19083

Bill Stewart Conservation Chair Delmarva Ornithological Society PO Box 4247 Greenville, DE 19807

Dan Silver Executive Director Endangered Habitats League 8424 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite A 592 Los Angeles, CA 90069-4267

David Harrison Conservation Chair Salem Audubon Society 189 Liberty St. NE, Suite 202 Salem, OR 97302

Kay Charter Executive Director Saving Birds Thru Habitat 5020 N. Putnam Road Omena, MI 49674-0288

Lori Udall Executive Director Sacharuna Foundation The Plains, Virginia Bethanie Walder Executive Director Wildlands CPR PO Box 7516 Missoula, MT 59807

Correspondence ID: 13808 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 12:59:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Re 1000 meter buffers (p121-127) no scientific reason cited for buffers this large. buffers required for birds not endangered. buffers and pre-nesting closures for birds (terns) that nest in our eaves & showers proving that they are not afraid of us. buffers as suggested by The Coalition for Beach Access (ranging from flush+15 to 200, as well as corridors for passage, make far more sense.

Correspondence ID: 13809 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I prefer restricting vehicle access during those times that shore birds and sea turtles are breeding. Seasonal usage by ORVs should be allowed outside of those breeding and nesting windows.

Correspondence ID: 13810 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:00:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The Coastal Conservation Association North Carolina wishes to comment on the recently released Draft Environmental Impact Statement on the ORV Management plan for Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area issued by the National Park Service. The objective of CCA is to conserve, promote and enhance the present and future availability of these coastal resources for the benefit and enjoyment of the general public. As such the thousands of members and volunteers of CCA NC and their nearly three quarters of a million associated recreational anglers are very disappointed in the six options for ORV management on CHNSRA. First of all the document itself is very difficult to follow in its 800+ pages. The tragedy is that none of the six options reflect the wishes of the vast majority of the CHNSRA visiting public and CCA NC. While there are preferred environmental and NPS options, there is no pro-access preferred option. The CHNSRA was established specifically for the American public to enjoy the seashore. To propose no option which provides a maximum access option certainly violates the spirit and perhaps the letter of the laws establishing this national park. Without serving the visiting public, The NPS has failed in its responsibility to our citizens. All the options presented in the DEIS seek to restrict public access well beyond any reasonable or legal requirement. It is clear that significant facts have been ignored in the preparation of this DEIS. The success of turtle nesting and piping plover nesting and fledging is virtually unchanged since the de facto ORV plan was implemented in 1978. The primary causes of failed nesting and fledging are overwhelmingly predation and weather events which have occurred for hundreds of years. ORV caused mortality is a fraction of 1%. The USFWS and NPS personnel have caused more plover mortality. Yet, the NPS chooses to attack those users who are very sensitive to the wildlife in the CHNSRA. The DEIS options all include restrictions which, when implemented as they have been under the consent decree, will unnecessarily close miles and miles of beach access both from the ocean and sound side. The many options describe no action which can circumvent a nesting closure in order to access an open area of the beach. Thus, while a stretch of waterfront may be "open" it is inaccessible. This represents nothing more than verbal trickery and masks the true available waterfront. The specifics of option F, the NPS preferred option, require at least some comment as commenting on all options would extend beyond the available space and time constraints. Overall, the DEIS suggests there would be 52 of 68 miles of the waterfront "open" to ORV access but it is not clear that this includes any calculation of sound side access for ORVs or pedestrians. CCA NC strongly believes the "buffer" or closure areas suggested for piping plovers in various stages of nesting and fledging are beyond excessive. For nesting piping plovers 50 meters is more than adequate and as is 200 meters for unfledged chicks. To suggest that unfledged chicks of a bird that is less than 1 foot tall requires over a mile of seashore is ludicrous! All this with no pass through or corridor around these areas closes vast areas of the CHNSRA to the American public. All other shore birds should be allocated no more than 30m for nesting and 30m for unfledged chicks with pass through corridors as there is no legal requirement to provide excessive buffers. In addition, the NPS fails to recognize the role played by the spoil islands behind Bodie Island, Hatteras Island, Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge and Ocracoke Island in the breeding of shore birds. These areas are typically with a few hundred yards of the CHNSRA and harbor large populations of shore birds. If the NPS truly wants to help the population of piping plovers they should investigate the usage of large cages placed around the nests to keep predators out of the nests. These are used in the Northeast where the major piping plover nesting takes place. The NPS and the USFWS seem content to kill hundreds of other wildlife to try to protect piping plovers but refuse to implement simpler techniques improve shore bird breeding success while improving access as well. Option F describes measures required to "improve turtle breeding success". Many of the restrictions described in option F have little basis in peer reviewed science. For example, there is no evidence that night driving of ORVs has any impact on turtle nesting or hatchling survival. There have been no female turtles killed by ORVs. To protect turtle nests and improve hatchling success, CCA NC recommends relocation of turtle nests when they are laid in areas exposed to weather events. Using the fences used on the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge that are keyhole shaped are more effective for turtle hatchlings and would allow continued use of ORVs at night. The surf zone of CHNSRA has been used for a hundred years for the purposes of swimming, sunbathing, fishing, birding and shelling. ORV usage is critical to the pursuit of these activities as much of the surf zone would be inaccessible without ORVs. The NPS, throughout the DEIS, seeks only to restrict ORV usage without proposing ways to improve access for ORVs and providing expanded habitat for those species which are threatened or endangered. It seems the NPS has forgotten the CHNSRA was established as a recreation area. Pea Island National Wildlife Sanctuary is for wildlife, yet under the de facto rules in place from 1978, there has been little difference in the successful breeding of piping plovers or endangered sea turtles. CCA NC urges you to revert to those rules put in place in 1978 to provide maximum access for ORVs and the American citizens.

0012614

Correspondence ID: 13811 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: RE: ORV DEIS
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS, I must disagree with any of the six alternatives.
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 is far superior 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 the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Sincerely,
Michael and Kim Huff Rodanthe, NC

Correspondence ID: 13812 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Buddenbohn, Robert
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. I am a firm believer that humans and wildlife are not mutually exclusive and rather - that they can not only coexist but in many respects can and do actually benefit from responsible guidelines which allow for the two to coexist. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Bob Buddenbohn 2805 W Arkansas #303 Arlington, TX 76016

Correspondence ID: 13813 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Livingston, Richard W
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. It is unbelievable that our park be turned into a place where a handful of select people can close our beaches to the thousands of fisherman and vacationers who visit our beaches yearly. 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. Take the right stand here, tradition means alot to your profession....it means alot to our townspeople and visitors as well.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Respectfully submitted,
Richard and Joy Livingston 46285 Old Lighthouse road, PO Box 542 Buxton, NC 27920

Correspondence ID: 13814 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Courtney, Carolyn
Received: May,11,2010 13:03:19
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments are as follows: 1) Time to respond should be extended. 2) One of the most beautiful places I've shared with my family has been on the points of Ocracoke and Hatteras Island. To close access is denying families the opportunity to observe and learn about nature and all it has to offer. There is more than enough area for the wildlife & families to co-exist. Closing these areas would be detrimental to the economy of Ocracoke & Hatteras as well. 3) I feel the birds, turtles, etc need to be protected, but lets look at real science and smart methods that will provide for all. 4)Consideration to recreational areas needs to be improved. 5) Look elsewhere for proactive techniques to encourage turtle nesting (evidence in other east coast areas is available). 6) Smarter decisions should be made when determining which vegetation is cleared. 7) Relocate turtle nests when storms threaten the nest. 8) Allow pets under control, leashed etc - to prohibit the family friend is not solving any problems. 9) I don't agree with killing predators that put eggs at risk. This measure is beyond what God/Mother Nature and the circle of life present - Man should not interfere. 10) Clearly, the economic impact will be great on these areas with such stringent closures. I alone, had spent between \$5K - \$10K in rentals, spending, fishing permits, etc.....the year - I've spent \$0. I'm just one family of many who aren't coming down again this year. (From 1996 - 2008 - we did not miss a year!)

Correspondence ID: 13815 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 13:03:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Re expanding closure due to violations Would suggest that enforcement of rules is better than punishing all the villagers (see Nazi, Viet Cong history).

Correspondence ID: 13816 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:05:33
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have been visiting the Outer Banks for over 30 years , spring , summer , fall and winter and in all these years I have yet to see any interaction between people and birds that I would consider detrimental to the bird population .In the past if there were any nests the park service did an excellent job of bordering the site as to not allow any access to interfere with the natural process of bird life ,turtle life etc. I would love to see the survival of an entire island , that God created , and gave , yes, man the authority to govern over, not someone separated from the reality of the consequences to economy and society as a whole . Many people all over the country will be affected by beach closures of this magnitude, please take all circumstances into consideration before making another knee jerk decision like the one that started this entire process ! sincerely , Jim

Correspondence ID: 13817 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Piland, Hilary C
Received: May,11,2010 13:05:43
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Sir or Madam,

I disagree strongly with the increased limitations to beach access proposed in the DEIS. The main reason (among many others) is commerce. The economy of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area is based on tourism. If large parts of the beaches are not accessible to our visitors, then the local economy would suffer tremendously. The many miles of open and undeveloped beaches within the Seashore are what give Cape Hatteras its' own unique niche in this "highly competitive for tourist dollars" market. Without beach access by pedestrians and ORVs in the more remote beaches, the economy within the Seashore would suffer. The beaches of Cape Hatteras make up a large part of Dare County's beaches and therefore bring tourist dollars that Dare County could not live without and in turn North Carolina's fiscal status would suffer. Other beaches along the coast have hotels and cottages that line the beach. That scenario is great for tourists that simply want to enjoy the beach with what they can carry by hand. But, the long stretched beaches of Cape Hatteras give an opportunity like no other for fishing, surfing, kayaking, boogie boarding, wind surfing, kite boarding, picnicking, commercial fishing and horseback riding. A majority of visitors to the island come just for these activities. They come back year after year or several times a year, simply because these activities are allowed here and conditions are ideal. The tourists that come here for these activities will always come here (as long as the beaches are open).

Also, why is the keep away distance from nests 1,000 meters? Is that truly necessary, and if so where is the research/data backing that? In addition, your own studies state that human interference has an insignificant impact on nesting survival. Plus, there are already wonderful wild life refuges all over eastern North Carolina. With Pea Island Wild Life Refuge already making up a very large part of the island, how can 1000 meters in the middle of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation area be justified?

It is important for those against ORV access to know that the ORV use is simply the mode of transportation to get to the site of their favorite recreations. The ORV use is not the recreation. The vast majority of users highly respect the beach and wildlife as well as the 15 mph speed limit. Those who do not, should be penalized accordingly, but not such that it penalizes everyone else.

I lived on wonderful Cape Hatteras Island for 18 years. My ancestors made a good life for themselves here as far back as I can count. I come back often and hope to come back to live eventually ? if the local economy is still intact. I live in Virginia now and have had countless conversation with Virginians who are delighted to tell me all about their favorite recreations at Cape Hatteras. One man at the meat counter at my grocery store said with excitement, "You're from the Cape. I love to go down there whenever I can. It's such a neat place, like no other." He was referring to his joy and amazement of what it was like to fishing of Cape Point. A colleague of mine told me he saves his vacation time all year to spend two weeks in the summer to "fish of Cape Point". He stays at the Tower Circle Motel and he named of all the restaurants where he and his family like to eat. They don't bother stopping at Nags Head to let the kids play put put or shop. All they want to do is get down to the open spaced beaches of Cape Hatteras and spend their days fishing and doing and what we all deserve once in a while ? our favorite recreations. I believe a workable compromise can be made between recreation and wildlife. I am sure you will too!

Hilary Piland Richmond, VA

Correspondence ID: 13818 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Farrow, Jennie R
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954

Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.

I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.

Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Jennie Farrow

Correspondence ID: 13819 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:08:11
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence:

Dear Superintendent Murray, I write this letter to voice my opposition to Option F of the Draft EIS for ORV management at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. As a scientist, educator, and life-long visitor to Hatteras Island, I am deeply disturbed by the impact the proposed management plan will have on Cape Hatteras for a variety of reasons. My grandparents first traveled to visit the beaches of Cape Hatteras in the 1950's because of the amazing natural beauty, great fishing, and exceptional ORV access to the beaches. Since that time, most of my extended family, along with our friends and their relatives, has traveled hundreds of miles at a shot and spent countless thousands of hours visiting the Recreation Area. The proposed regulations of Option F of the Draft EIS will certainly end almost sixty years of regular trips to Hatteras by an extended group that now includes well over one hundred people. The proposed plan will not only end the experience in Hatteras as we have all known it, but prevent my children and future generations from enjoying the beaches of Hatteras as we have for so many years as responsible stewards of the seashore. The proposed plan will also devastate the economy of Cape Hatteras and provide tremendous hardship for the residents who have always been wonderful hosts and friends to those of us who have traveled from all over the world to enjoy the unique Hatteras experience. If the proposed plan is enacted as law, there is almost no incentive for us to incur the cost and effort to travel from Pennsylvania, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Delaware, Georgia, and so on. In order to keep this letter relatively brief, I will focus my statement of opposition to a handful of points. Excessive buffer size I have completed a relatively extensive literature search in order to find data that substantiates the need for 1000m buffers. I have not found any literature that substantiates the need of 1000m buffers for successful breeding. Even the 200m buffer is probably excessive. The 100m buffers would certainly be the best compromise of wildlife protection and protecting recreational access. The goal of the EIS process is to identify reasonable environmental protection. The 1000m buffers are completely outside the realm of practical and reasonable protection. As an aside, the literature also does not support the implication (by Defenders of Wildlife, SELC, Audubon Society, etc.) that direct human interactions (such as ORV use) are affecting shorebird populations on even remotely the same scale as storms or predation. The buffers will negatively and dramatically affect the human visitor experience with almost no benefit to shorebird populations. Economic impact underestimated. The economic impact identified in the draft EIS greatly underestimates the economic impact the proposed options would have on the villages of Cape Hatteras. The great majority of those of us who travel to Hatteras to fish, surf, shell etc. stay in Avon, Buxton, Frisco and Hatteras Village. Other visitors who are less interested in the outdoor sports aspect of the vacation are content visiting the northern towns on the Outer Banks, which do not require the same amount of ORV access. The proposed options, particularly Option F, will have a dramatically disproportionate affect on the economy of the lower Cape Hatteras Villages that have typically relied on commercial fishing and recreational fishing related tourism. People who visit Duck, Corolla, Kill Devil Hills, and Kitty Hawk could have very similar experiences to what they have now if Option F is enacted. However, those of us who visit the southern towns have had and will have a dramatically different experience than in the past. We cannot justify driving the extra miles and incurring the extra expenses associated with traveling Buxton and Avon if we can't even access the beaches as we have for the fifty years prior to recent changes. The result will be tremendous economic hardship for the residents of lower Dare County. Such extreme impact could be mitigated by not enacting Option F. Corridors The proposed Option F dramatically limits user access to the seashore. A better plan would ensure access for all people through the use of many more ORV corridors than the option would provide. The beaches of

Cape Point, False Point, and Ocracoke South and North Points in particular and the beaches of the Outer Banks in general provide incredibly unique and productive fishing opportunities for shore bound fishermen. The proposed plan would create a situation where anyone who is not of excellent health and fitness has very limited access to the beach. My own two grandfathers, ages 83 and 93, still enjoy some access to the beaches they have loved for so many years. If the proposed plan is enacted, neither of them will be able to traipse over dunes and through deep sand to access the beach, let alone walk the mile to The Point in waders lugging fishing equipment. ORV access in Hatteras is special and should be preserved. Along with that, the last thing any of us would like to see is large areas of impermeable surfaces placed on the beautiful dunes to provide parking. I do not see how anyone, scientist or not, can believe that created parking lots is a better option than low impact beach driving. If areas must be closed to ORV traffic, then a plan must dictate that every effort should be made to create corridors around those areas to provide access to open areas. In closing, I love the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area with all of my heart. The ORV management plan, once enacted, is certainly going to permanently change the way we enjoy the park. I urge you to choose an option that provides the strictest possible protection for human access, while at the same time protecting the shore as a viable area for wildlife use. Option F dramatically shifts the park from an area for humans and wildlife toward a wild life preserve. You have the power to strike a reasonable balance and I speak as a scientist, a fisherman, and an environmentalist when I urge you to please opt for an option that allows us much less restrictive access than that proposed in Option F. The people, who use the park and love the park are the ones who will fight to protect every aspect of it for future generations. Each generation in my family has done so for the last sixty years, and will continue to do so if you take this opportunity to make the correct decision and not implement Option F. Sincerely, Owen Zimmerman MA Ed. Earth Science (Candidate) Penn State University M.S. Environmental Science, University of Newhaven B.S. Biology, Moravian College

Correspondence ID: 13820 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:08:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Off road vehicles do not belong in our national parks.

Correspondence ID: 13821 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Mitchell, C. Madeline
Received: May,11,2010 13:09:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I would hope that alternative D would be selected. Preserving the natural habitat and a national treasure would seem to me to be the only logical alternative. We are not deprived access to the seashore under this plan, yet preserve more habitat. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13822 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:10:08
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Access to the beach is essential to the economy here on the Outer Banks. We are supported by the tourist industry and they will not continue to visit the outer banks and spend their money if they are not allowed access to the beaches. I understand there are environmental concerns but really, who is going to be able to survive here on the outer banks without any tourism. The outer banks has grown to what it is because of the tourist attraction to the beach and yes the preserving nature is part of that, but that has to be some sort of balance. Not eliminating the public and the income to preserve nature that is going to destroy itself due to the lack of human interaction. Tourism finances this area, we have been hit hard by this economy to take away the access to the beautiful beaches is going to be the final straw. I dare say there is not nearly as much income brought to the outer banks by nature as there is by tourism. Find a better alternative!

Correspondence ID: 13823 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Barley, William V
Received: May,11,2010 13:10:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Sir,
I stand opposed to the DEIS as released. My economic livelihood and that of my children and grandchildren will be negatively impacted forever. The access for pedestrians and ORVs is too limited in all cases. I strongly urge you to support and implement the Coalition for Beach Access statement which is truly fair to animals, resources and people.
Sincerely,
Bill Barley

Correspondence ID: 13824 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: MARKS, THERESA A
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: PLEASE HELP

Correspondence ID: 13825 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:13:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: It's commendable that a plan is in the works. I've enjoyed beach driving in both the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and the Cape Lookout National Seashore for many years, and I hope that can continue. It's important to protect the environment while at the same time allowing for recreational activities, such as beach driving.
Beach recreation is an important part of the economy around Ocracoke and Cape Hatteras. Part of the allure of going to the Outer Banks is being able to drive on the beach. This is especially true in places like Ocracoke where you can't even get to the beach without the aide of an ORV. If that access were taken away or severely limited, people may not go to those places like they do now, which would hurt the local economy.
I'm all for the environment and protecting wildlife. The current crisis with the oil spill along the gulf coast is a reminder of how fragile ecosystems are and how much humans can have an effect. It's important to keep vehicles off the dunes to prevent erosion and out of nesting areas to protect species. At the same time, there's no need to go overboard.
A few weeks ago, I was on Portsmouth Island, part of the Cape Lookout National Seashore. Beach driving is allowed on Portsmouth Island. There were plenty of signs posted to remind drivers to stay on the paths and keep off the dunes, which is important in preventing erosion and protecting the integrity of the barrier islands. There were also large areas that were restricted because of nesting birds or sea turtles. Some of these nesting areas were very wide open and crossing them by vehicle would have made traversing the island much easier. However, I didn't see any birds nesting in that area. While that doesn't mean necessarily mean that birds don't use that area for nesting, it did seem like they had too much area blocked off.
Since protected species are closely monitored by ecologists and wildlife authorities, the nesting patterns are probably well understood and predictable. Instead of closing off large areas of the beach all the time, why not only do it during the times the birds or turtles are nesting? Or maybe have staff

0012617

monitoring nesting activity and directing traffic during those times (this could also create jobs). There's plenty of room for both humans and animals, so I hate to see restrictions made so strict as to prevent humans from enjoying the beach.

I will be interested to see what the final plan will be. Please keep in mind that beach driving is an important part of healthy, recreational activities and crucial to the local economy. It should be kept in place while at the same time instituting level-headed precautions and restrictions to protect the local ecosystem. Through careful compromise, I believe both goals can be achieved. This draft is a good step in that direction.

Correspondence ID: 13826 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gordon Thompson, Katherine White and
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: May 11, 2010
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as our comments on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. My husband and I are both full time residents of Hatteras Island. Like many others who reside here, we first were introduced to the area in 1986 while vacationing here. At that time and annually for the next 12 years our only vacation destination was Hatteras Island where we enjoyed camping (at Frisco Woods Campground), windsurfing, fishing, surfing and beach going, etc. We fell in love with the quiet island way of life (which in many ways was similar to our New Hampshire lifestyle), and in 1998 moved here permanently, purchased a plot of land, built a new house, and now call Frisco, NC home. We are both employed by Midgett Realty (for over 8 years and counting) and solely rely on the tourist-based economy of Hatteras Island for our livelihood. We have a vested interest in protecting the future of Hatteras Island as a whole; our property, our friends, the people who live here, access to the seashore and the beaches, the natural surroundings, wildlife, sea life, and all that makes this island special.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS we must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. We 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. We believe that a reasonable and realistic approach into the management of CHNSRA will allow adequate protection of wildlife while maintaining a balance and necessary access to our beaches and seashore. As residents we are hosts of this beautiful island and welcome visitors. It has been our belief and experience that together we all share an interest and an obligation in preserving and protecting access to this land and the seashore for our families now. In turn, generations to come will be able to enjoy all that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area has to offer, both now and in the future.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area (CHNSRA).
Thank you for your consideration of this very important issue.
Respectfully, Gordon Thompson and Katherine White
PO Box 342 Frisco, NC 27936

Correspondence ID: 13827 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Levis, Jack
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Jack Levis 57228 Summerplace Dr Hatteras, NC 27941

Correspondence ID: 13828 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Barley, Will P
Received: May,11,2010 13:16:32
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Sir,
I am 81 years old and rely on a cane in order to walk at this stage of my life. If Alternative F is implemented, I will only be able to view the ocean through a pair of binoculars since it will be impossible for me to get there. You don't have the right to deny me reasonable access to MY National Seashore. I also strongly oppose banning leashed pets anywhere that trucks and pedestrians are allowed.
Sincerely,
William P. Barley

Correspondence ID: 13829 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Mayberry, April
Received: May,11,2010 13:17:09
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a life-long citizen of North Carolina, I implore the National Park Service to take every step possible to protect our delicate coastal ecology. If certain people put more thought into the consequences of their personal actions and were more considerate of others, extra protections of the coastal areas might not be necessary. Unfortunately, this is not the case. As it is, every time I go to the beach, I see examples of irresponsible beach goers harming animals and the environment with activities, such as driving into delicate areas and carelessly leaving behind fishing line and other debris. Consequences of these actions are beach erosion, destruction of nesting grounds and other wildlife habitats, injury and death to wildlife as well as degradation of the scenic quality and loss of commercial viability of the coastal regions.
As we become more educated and conscious of the extreme environmental degradation that we are causing, we should be doing more to protect our ecosystems not less. We should think carefully as a society before we make any decision that could lead to irreparable damage. It is better to err on the side of caution than risk destroying one of the quintessential areas that make North Carolina so special. Many say that economic concern outweigh ecological concerns. My response is, without a healthy ecology, there can be no economic stability.

Correspondence ID: 13830 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:17:44
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Please limit vehicular traffic at this spectacular and special area which needs to be preserved in as pristine condition as possible. There is no need in this age of decreasing natural resources of all kinds to cater to gas-consuming bad habits of too many members of our society. This special habitat needs to be appreciated on foot!

Correspondence ID: 13831 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Piland, Michael
Received: May,11,2010 13:18:03
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the limitations to beach access proposed in the DEIS. The island depends on tourism greatly. If you take away large parts of the beaches, you take away the vitality of the island. The many miles of open and undeveloped beaches within the Seashore are what give Cape Hatteras its own unique niche in the tourism industry over other beaches like Nags Head and Virginia Beach. Without beach access by pedestrians and ORVs in the more remote beaches, the economy within the Seashore would suffer. Surf Fishing, Kite Boarding, Shelling, horseback riding and Commercial Fishing are ideal along these beaches, that's why the tourist are willing to drive so far. Plus, your own studies state that human interference has an insignificant impact on nesting survival. There are already wonderful wild life refuges all over eastern North Carolina. With Pea Island Wild Life Refuge already making up a very large part of the island, how can 1000 meters in the middle of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation area be justified? Those against ORV access should know that the ORV use is simply the mode of transportation to get to the site of their favorite recreations. The ORV use is not the recreation. The vast majority of users highly respect the beach and wildlife as well as the 15 mph speed limit. Those who do not, should be penalized accordingly, but not such that it penalizes everyone else.
Michael Piland Richmond VA

Correspondence ID: 13832 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:19:41
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My husband and I have visited the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and surrounding area a couple of times on vacation. We find the area very welcoming and beautiful. We particularly enjoy the historical and environmental features. One of our favorite pastimes on vacation (or any time, for that matter) is birdwatching and taking nature hikes. Being from the Midwest, vacations to shore communities present a unique and special experience for us. Unfortunately, the last time we visited the area in question we had to leave and find a different section of beach because of the many off-road vehicles racing up and down the beach, creating noise and an unsafe condition for walking. I love sports and outdoor activities, but I find that the idea of such vehicles on a National Seashore don't seem to mix. In fact, my concept of the purpose of National Parks, Monuments, etc. that are included within the system are areas of significance to be preserved and enjoyed by the current and future generations of Americans. While off-road vehicle owners would be able to enjoy the National Seashore, they would in no way contribute to preserving it. Please keep the Cape Hatteras National Seashore free of the noise, pollution, and destructive ways of off-road vehicles so that the area may be preserved as an ecosystem for future generations to visit and enjoy.
Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13833 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: warner, dennis m
Received: May,11,2010 13:20:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the proposed DEIS because the National Park Service is not managing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area the way the United States Congress mandated it to be.
16USC459 CHNSRA Enabling Legislation (In Part) ? Specifically mandates that ".said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.."
How can the National Park Service ignore the intent of the United States Congress for the Cape Hatteras Seashore Recreation Area. Is this not illegal what the Park Service is doing ?

Correspondence ID: 13834 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Mills, William A
Received: May,11,2010 13:20:25
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I feel Alternative F restrictions far exceed those under the current Consent Decree and the Interim Management Strategy and are therefore unacceptable as a visitor to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
A few points:
This document states on p. 210 'Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk (from pedestrians and ORVs)'. No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as education improves. ORV users take the restrictions seriously, and I for one feel expanding the buffers for violations of the areas is to harsh a penalty unless real intent can be shown. I also urge the NPS to make an effort to investigate any violations to the point where the real culprits can be found and punish that person individually.
NPS ORV usage figures are flawed. ORV counts for Memorial Day 2009 and July 4, 2009 fail to recognize that Bodie Island Spit and Cape Point were closed to ORV access on these dates due to resource protection closures, which naturally led to increased ORV numbers at ramps 4, 43, 44, and 49.
Reference p. 265
NPS Resource Management pedestrian and ORV closure policies address the least significant factor affecting nest survival. Nest failures are predominantly due to non-human events (naturally occurring events), including predation, storm & lunar tides, and nest abandonment.
The DEIS ignores the traditional cultural importance of surf zone access to Outer Banks communities. This failure stands in direct violation of the NPS legal responsibility under Section 106 of the NEPA and NEPA framework as a whole.
The DEIS economic surveys are flawed. Economic analyses do not use data from the first full year of the Consent Decree (2008).
Alternative F, the NPS preferred alternative is attributed to the Advisory Committee. However, the rules, policies and procedures in Alternative F were not reviewed nor approved by the participants within the Reg-Neg process.
I would respectfully recommend that the 'Coalition for Beach Access' position statement be implemented to manage Cape Hatteras National Seashore as it is the only practical system to manage a recreation area, including Cape Hatteras National Seashore, the nation's first.
Sincerely
William Mills

Correspondence ID: 13835 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kohan, Michael
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence:

My name is Michael J Kohan. My address is 6524 Rocky Top Dr., Rougemont, NC 27572. My telephone # is 919-732-9272, cell phone is 919-632-2673. E-mail address is m_kohan@hotmail.com. I am 62 years old and have fished in the Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore for 37 years. I work, as a Biologist, at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 109 TW Alexander Dr., RTP, NC 27711. My comments are my own and do not reflect the position of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). I do not agree with any of the six alternative plans described in the DEIS and I do support the Coalition for Beach Access ORV Access Environmental Impact Position Statement. I would like to comment on certain elements in the Alternative F plan that the NPS prefers. Pages 121 -127 describe the buffer closures for piping plovers, American oyster catcher, and colonial waterfowl. I believe the closures proposed are excessive and not based on peer reviewed science. Where is the data that shows that 1000 meters is any more protective than 200 meters? No other Seashore has a 1000 meter buffer. For unfledged piping plover chicks, 200 meters is the standard in other seashores. In all cases ORV access to the surf line should be permitted at all times by establishing a 50 meter corridor starting at the high tide line, if nests are not present within 200 meters. American Oyster Catcher (AMOy) and colonial waterfowl unfledged chicks buffer zones are also very restrictive. A study by Conner et al., Wilson Journal of Ornithology, 2006: 11 8(4) p485-493 states that there is little or no association between ORV traffic and time spent on the nest. Case in point, there has been an AMOY nest on the sound side of Highway 12 between Avon and Buxton. They are not disturbed by all the traffic on Hw12. Again, 200 meters is too restrictive. Thirty meters is a more reasonable buffer. There seems to be an attempt to eliminate ORV access to prime fishing and recreational areas during the prime tourist season. There have been no cases of piping plovers being killed by an ORV in Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore. Also, during the consent decree, no increase in fledged chicks has occurred. In fact, there was a decrease in fledged chicks in 2009 compared to 2008. Predators and weather events have a greater effect on successful nesting than ORV's do. In fact, only 3% of nesting failures is "estimated" to be caused by human interference. A more protective stance by the NPS in predator and vegetative management will result in higher nesting successes. If the NPS would till all the vegetation around Cape Point, the piping plovers will have prime forage area and they will nest away from ORV traffic. The argument that the NPS wants nature to take its course does not hold for not managing the vegetation. Predators are destroyed by the hundreds and new parking lots are being proposed in wetlands. The NPS needs to strike a reasonable balance between beach access and preserving the amazing ecology of the Seashore. As an employee of the U.S. EPA, I do want to see all of the birds of the Seashore to thrive. As mentioned above, other measures can accomplish this goal without the draconian measures stated in Alternative F. Pets are also being banned from the CHNRS during nesting season, even on a leash. What evidence exists that leashed dogs in the CHNRS affect the nesting success of any bird? People bring their pets on summer vacations. I am starting to believe that the only threatened species at CHNRS is Homo Sapiens! The DEIS is also concerned that ORV's pose a threat to loggerhead sea turtles. The NPS' own figures over the last 10 years shows only 14 eggs/hatchlings have been destroyed/killed by ORV's out of a potential 94,000 eggs. This does not sound like a huge problem to me. Again, as with the birds, weather events and predators are more destructive to turtle recovery than human interference. Better predator management and relocation of nests will be more beneficial to the turtles than restricting ORV access. Another concern is that the lights of an ORV may cause false crawls. What is the ratio of false crawls to nests on Pea Island. I would imagine the ratio would be about 1: 1, the same as it is on Hatteras Island. Pea Island does not have ORV's. That would debunk that theory. I am opposed to restricting night driving on the Island between May 1 and November 15, because again, there is no peer reviewed evidence that ORV lights disorient Sea turtles and cause false crawls in the CHNRS. I do believe that permits should be issued so that the NPS knows the number of potential ORV users at night during the turtle nesting season. I do believe there needs to be a full beach closure close to hatching times with volunteers watching the nest. The NPS plans to institute a permit system for ORV with some kind of cost associated with it. I am in favor of a permit system including paying for it, if the money remains in CHNRS. The seasonal ORV closures are longer for Frisco, Hatteras Village and Ocracoke as opposed to Avon and the trivillages. Why is this? The visitation rates are very similar. Another problem with the DEIS (pg270-281;561-698) pertains to the socioeconomic analysis of the CHNRS. The region of influence (ROI!) includes essentially all of Dare County, including Duck and Southern Shores. These villages are not impacted economically like the Hatteras villages. ORV access is almost a non issue in the northern cities compared to the Hatteras villages. The ROI should only include the Hatteras villages and a survey of the businesses should have happened during the 2009 season, the first full year of closure. Many visitors were unaware or did not fully understand the amount of closures caused by the consent decree in 2008. Only model surveys and not actual business surveys were done. Also, I understand that Research Triangle Institute is doing an economic impact study, but their results will not be ready by May 11. The small businesses are hurting on Hatteras Island and if the DEIS becomes law, many will close their doors. The cultural and historical values of surf zone access to the Outer Banks has been almost completely ignored by the DEIS. Only 2 paragraphs are dedicated to the analysis of cultural resource issues. The DEIS, as defined by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEP A), is required to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. The DEIS (pg15, 18, 83, 259, and 260) describes various ORV activities that are historical and cultural in nature. Look at the cover page of the DEIS document! Why does the NPS essentially ignore it's responsibility as spelled out in NEPA and refuses to acknowledge the long historical and cultural values of surf zone access on the Outer Banks. Finally, I would like to end my comments with a few questions. Why was Alternative F attributed to the advisory committee? The majority of people on the committee did not review or approve Alternative F. Why is there not a round-the-clock NPS presence to deter vandalism? The CHNRS visitors should not be punished by expanding buffers because NPS does not patrol the buffers day and night. Signed by: Michael J. Kohan

Correspondence ID: 13836 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kiker, Joe M
Received: May,11,2010 13:24:07
Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I agree with the NPS Guidelines which state, "A traditional Cultural Property designation can and should be based on patterns of land use that reflect cultural traditions valued by the long term residents of the local community."
Being a long time visitor to Hatteras Island, this weekend I was saddened to see the the possible break in a long ago formed community - those whose relatives gave their land to the NPS with the hope that their families would continue to enjoy living in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.
I disagree with the restrictive closure of the beach areas. My family is very supportive of protecting wildlife, but wildlife adjusts to living patterns when there are thousands of acres available to them. I hope that you will consider that human interference has an insignificant impact on survival of the birds in such an expanse of land.

Correspondence ID: 13837 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 13:24:56
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.
Sincerely, Alexandra Gawreliuk

Correspondence ID: 13838 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 13:25:31
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: DO NOT allow offroad vehicles and leave the Cape as pristine as it was. Thanks.

Correspondence ID: 13839 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Vercruyse, Jane
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: To Whom It May Concern: As a Veteran with 24 years of service with the United States Navy, I have demonstrated my desire to help keep the United States a free nation, indivisible, with liberty for all. As a child of an immigrant, I realize the vast opportunities afforded me by and in this nation. My husband and I have been residents of Avon for 5 years, moving her to enjoy all of the treasures of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Unfortunately, our access to many of our favorite points of the seashore has been limited by the Consent Decree now in force. For the future, I fear that the enactment of Alternative F of the DEIS will further destroy our ability to even look at many areas of the seashore. I am capable of walking from proposed entry sties to the actual seashore, but everyone is not. I have a 90 year old mother who visits yearly and a sister who is disabled by Multiple Sclerosis who also is a frequent visitor. Neither of them can walk on the uneven sand surfaces of the beach without difficulty. Many local residents, as well as visitors, are elderly and or disabled Many young disabled war veterans now come to the National Seashore to quiet their minds; should they not be allowed to eEnjoy the seashore as they desire? Alternative F of the DEIS attempts to allow the disabled access to the beach: "Accessibility for the Disabled The Seashore would provide access to disabled visitors as follows: ? Beach access points and boardwalks compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act Requirements would be provided at Coquina Beach, the Frisco Boathouse, the Ocracoke PonyPen, and the Ocracoke day use area ? Beach access would be provided through the issuance of special use permits for areas in front ofthe villages to allow ORVs to transport disabled visitors to the beach and then return the vehicl eback to the street. ? Beach wheelchairs could be checked out at each District on a first-come, first-served basis." The Americans with Disabilities Act actually states that "Physical and mental disabilities in no way diminish a person's right to fully participate in all aspects of society, but that people with physical or mental disabilities are frequently precluded from doing so because of prejudice, antiquated attitudes, or the failure to remove societal and institutional barriers I believe alternative F of the DEIS would preclude the disabled and the elderly from fully participating in enjoyment of the national seashore. Institutional barriers, as stated in the above paragraph "Accessibility for the Disabled", will be created by only having certain beach access points and boardwalks actually available for the disabled. Many disabled visitors would be unable to use the beach access in front of the villages, as they may be the driver of the vehicle and unable to return the vehicle to the street. Beach wheelchairs are very difficult to push and are very expensive to purchase. I doubt each District will have many wheelchairs; there is only one now at the CHNS. In addition, an elderly person would be unable to push their disabled partners over the sand. As a healthy adult, I have difficulty pushing the beach wheelchair in the sand. All American citizens and foreign visitors should be allowed to take part of liberties offered by the freedom of open beaches. The DEIS severely lessens the chance that a non-disabled person can enjoy the beach. The disabled will become shut-ins as they are shunned from the beach. Respectfully, Jane Vercruyse CDR, UNN, Ret

Correspondence ID: 13840 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
As a member of the National Parks Conservation Association and 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.
Protecting wildlife and visitors from OVR use is especially important to me, not only because I value the lives of the wildlife inhabitants that so badly need the opportunity for unobstructed living in their natural habitat, as well as the fragile ecosystem which can be altered irrevocably by misuse, but because I also believe that the safety of people visiting the parks should be considered.
My great-grandmother was run over some years ago by a vehicle while she was strolling on a beach at sunset. She was enjoying the beauty of nature, and supposedly so were the people in the vehicle - but at what cost? A life was lost and a family changed because rules were not in place at that time to protect the innocent pedestrians enjoying the beach/park in quiet. Although the vehicle in this situation was not an OVR, but a car which was then allowed to drive on the actual beach with the rest of the public, I think that the damage OVR's make - on the landscape, to the land itself, and in the noise they create, and in the physical danger to wildlife and people they pose, should NOT be overlooked. The "rights" of OVR users should not come before the rights of others.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving 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,
Rosemary DeSena

Correspondence ID: 13841 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Quinerly, James R

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: 11 March 2001
 Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
 Dear Superintendent Murray,
 Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
 After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
 I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
 Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13842 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Butler, Carol
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: On April 27, 2010, my husband and I attended the DEIS meeting held at the Wright Brothers Memorial. Superintendent Murray, I know you haven't been here that long, but I was impressed that you seemed genuinely interested in what the local residents had to say by taking notes.
 The OBX is a unique and wonderful barrier island. That is why I support the Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement and that is the one that should be used because it was written by people that work and live here that really care about the access to the beaches for all people and the future of the residents.
 I disagree with using resources from FL, GA, TX, MI, MA, and other states and countries on how to manage our beaches. Their beaches are probably different from our beaches and environment. I also disagree (page 533, ex of the University of Idaho) with people that don't live here or work here to have an input on how to manage our beaches.
 I agree with the Visitor Centers having information on the closures. A couple of weeks ago, we stopped at the center in Whalebone Junction and the volunteer there didn't know anything about the closures or even what the DEIS was. The DEIS statement on line you couldn't read the charts. When I showed my co-workers the DEIS hard copy they all said "You got to be kidding." That is why I disagree with the 60 day comment period. I am still reading it and will not be finished with it by the May 11 deadline. I have to take exception with the socioeconomic resources, page 270-289, where you include Duck, Southern Shores, Kitty Hawk, Manteo, because they are not part of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. However, if you are going to include them, then you should take into consideration, that beach driving is prohibited year round at Duck, Southern Shores and Kitty Hawk. Those people that want to experience the beach without vehicles should go there , plus they can go to Coquina up to Ramp 2; South Side of the Oregon Inlet bridge and walk the jetties; plus Pea Island.
 I disagree with the buffers as they seem excessive. The 1000m buffer for the migratory Piping Plover, which is not endangered, is absurd. I also read where the ghost crabs are capable of destroying the piping plover eggs, but at the same time it is mention that ORV's are destroying the ghost crabs. Aren't you destroying the coyote and foxes to protect the plover? I really feel that you should check out the dredge and spoil islands to see how many birds are there and since you are using resources from other states, might want to check out Portsmouth Island, even though it isn't in the CHNS jurisdiction.
 I do take exception to the Alternatives, especially Alternative F. I take exception that would limit the number of vehicles on the beaches. What happens when a group of friends want to fish together or there is a family reunion, like we witnessed a couple of weeks ago, and you have the rules of one vehicle per twenty feet. I do take exception to the millions of dollars that it will cost to implement any of the alternatives in these hard economic times, especially on Hatteras Island.
 ORV drivers have only certain areas where they can drive, unlike the pedestrians where they have more options. On page 263, in 1978 there were 28 ramps, now we are down to 17. With the beach closures due to the consent decree and beach closings for the birds and turtles, high tides, we are very limited where we can actually drive. As stated in the brochure "Driving at CHNS- The use of off-road vehicles (ORV's) is a traditional way for visitors to enjoy the Seashore's ocean beaches and sound side waters. But if any of your alternatives are implemented, then there will be no more tradition and the ORV's will be the threatened species.
 P. S. I am wondering if anyone has tried to raise the threatened birds in captivity and try growing the amaranth in a green house.

Correspondence ID: 13843 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Oetting, Heidi C
Received: May,11,2010 13:28:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I urge you to allow access to the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I am the owner of rental home in the town of Avon and fear that aggressive prohibiting of public access to the beaches will have a huge negative impact on our investment. Our family has been visiting the Cape Hatteras National Seashore for the past 15 years. Please allow our family and renters the opportunity to have access to the beautiful beaches of Cape Hatteras. Our rental home is property that we will retire to, please do not place such aggressive limits to the beaches that would prevent me from enjoying walks along the beach.

Correspondence ID: 13844 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Crammond, Laurie
Received: May,11,2010 13:28:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I support limiting ORV use on all parts of the National Seashore. While I understand that my wish will never be a reality, I urge you to limit access as much as possible, especially during the spring, summer and fall months when wildlife are active in those habitats.

Correspondence ID: 13845 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:29:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I lived at the beach and drove on the beach in Hatteras for 18 years and would hate to see it closed for any reason. I still visit regularly and this would stop me from going there as much. Hence killing the Economy. My mother lives in Hatteras and her livelihood would be threatened since she relies on tourism, as do many other Natives of the Outer Banks.

Correspondence ID: 13846 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:29:54
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: 13847 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Smith, Elizabeth

Received: May,11,2010 13:31:18

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am 33 years old and have been visiting Hatteras multiple times a year for my entire life. I just cannot imagine not being able to go on the beaches. My father and my brother both live in Hatteras Village and run charter boat companies. My husband and I have a home that we rent in Waves. The beach closures will devastate the local economy on Hatteras Island. People come to this place because it is so natural and so accessible. They come to explore and be close to nature. Everyone who comes to the Outerbanks appreciates the wildlife and respects it, but the Piping Plover will survive and will thrive despite people on the beaches and driving on the beaches. I implore you to stop the closure of the beaches and not to restrict access.
Sincerely, Elizabeth Smith

Correspondence ID: 13848 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Cutino, Albert

Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: Dear Mr. Murray,

I disagree with a number of the rules restricting access, for whatever reason, to the various beaches running in front of residential houses. Specific discussion of the issues are indicated below. But first let me say that I'm coming at this for strictly economic reasons. I own a house in Rodanthe. I upgraded it several years ago by adding a pool and hot tub deck area. Four years ago it was valued at \$650,000. The last estimated value, several weeks ago, was \$365,000. And that was stretching it. I'm hanging on by my finger nails trying to pay down a mortgage of \$327,000 and not just abandon the property. To say the least anything that restricts the use of the beach in front of my property or any vacation rental property will directly effect the rental income. In effect if you can't use the beach in front of the houses people will not vacation in the Outer Banks of NC. I request that the plan be amended to add the following: 1. P121-127 ... piping plover unfledged chick brood require closure of beach unless it extends in front of area around beach houses. 2. P121-127 ... American Oystercatcher nest ... amended to read unless it extends in front of area around beach houses .. 3. P136 ... Allow dogs on leashes in areas around beach houses. 4. P97-101... Allow more areas for ORV to access beaches to fish. I'm not saying allow total ORV access beaches. But I think the amount of area now considered is too large. 5. P97-101... Again on the areas where ORV are allowed don't restrict times of day/night for beach access/fishing. Some of the best times to fish are in the early morning and late at night. 6. P121 Allow for pedestrian access at all times to beaches in front of beach houses. I appreciate your taking into consideration my request for changes. I think some of the proposed changes are OK and needed. However don't hinder the visitors/renters from use of a great vacation spot.
Albert A. Cutino, 23101 Meadow Mist Rd, Clarksburg, MD 20872 Cell phone 301-706-3661.

Correspondence ID: 13849 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Adams, Nicole

Received: May,11,2010 13:31:31

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I am a long-time semi-resident of Hatteras Island. I am a nature lover and an avid volunteer at my local state park. I agree that off-road vehicles should be managed on Hatteras Island. As a "sensible driver," I am willing to make sacrifices for other, not-so-sensible drivers. I disagree with the severity of the proposed policy toward ORV and pedestrians. Birds, signs, ropes, etc. are much more visible to pedestrians and can be avoided more easily than in 4x4. 1000 meter restrictions for pedestrians are a tough restriction. Likewise, I disagree with barring pets from the beaches. I understand the nature of dogs to chase birds, but restricting them from all beaches, even leashed, is a very strict policy and sets a very harsh, unfriendly tone to say the least. I disagree with these points and ask why, after so many years of neglecting the situation, does the National Park Service not look within its total areas of management (it's overgrown marshlands) and rather go for extreme conditions on its beaches, effecting every single walk of life on Hatteras Island? I own a home that I do NOT rent to tourists. I do rent my home, but to year-round residents. They rely on tourism to make a living. If the policy is enforced as-is, there will be a severe negative economic effect on Hatteras Island and beyond.
I implore you to be more flexible when it comes time to set this policy. Barring visitors to a park was not the original intention of the founding of such a system. The parks exist for the people. I also ask the National Park Service to better use its total resources. The woods are overgrown, the marshlands neglected. Remember, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is more than its sandy beaches.

Correspondence ID: 13850 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Blakney, Harold

Received: May,11,2010 13:31:40

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I disagree with the DEIS as it does not achieve the primary goal as stated in the very first paragraph. The goal as stated: "to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources and natural processes, to provide a variety of visitor use experiences" has grossly been under emphasized and as compared to the 800 pages of background information related to wildlife, only a scant number of paragraphs are dedicated to the socioeconomic impacts of the extreme access restrictions and closures proposed. Not only have the level of closures (visitor, pedestrian and ORV) never been felt by this historic community, baselines and metrics with substantial proven data points are not available to fully quantify the devastating effects on the towns as well as the revenues to the county should the proposed closures be imposed. It is obvious even without the proper numbers and evaluations done, that the unique nature of the recreational, tourists, sporting, and fishing nature of this island would be significantly changed for the worse. As the NPS states that "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" should warrant a full and complete economic assessment. The historic and cultural impacts to the Island must also be a high priority if the NPS guideline above is to be complied with.

0012623

Correspondence ID: 13851 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Stevenson, Gina L
Received: May,11,2010 13:32:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with limited access to any beach on the Outer Banks. The argument is that we need to preserve these beaches for our children. But without access to the beach we are not preserving the beach we are archiving it. "Look children we made sure this lovely beach will always be here for you. Great Mommy, let's go there. Oh, honey we can't go there! At one time you could, you could drive on the beaches, ride horses on it, fish, walk the beach, watch the sunrise and at night because there were no big buildings with bright lights you could see billions of the amazing stars just hanging over the ocean. It was just beautiful. So beautiful we wanted to preserve it for you, but you can't go there. You are not allowed on the beach anymore". Think about this, if limiting beach access continues unchecked, at some point, our children could only be able to see the Outer Banks in e-books and on the Discovery channel. And at that point, 50 years from now, never having experienced the very thing we are trying to preserve for them, why will people continue to care about these beaches. Will they clean up an oil spill, will they work hard to save an animal or plant they have never seen? Children are much more likely to want to save a bird after taking a walk on the beach with the sand pipers leading the way or watching a pelican dive for his dinner. We must trust that we have raised our children to respect and cherish the beaches we love. We can only do this by sharing the beach with them, by showing them why we love it, some children will never hear the sound of the ocean, just the sound of their iPods. We need to work to protect the beach from the one percent who would not respect her beauty and still leave it available for the ninety-nine percent who will cherish her. Another issue is the breeding grounds of the wild birds. I have read statements that say if the proposed restrictions are to take place, and certain shorebirds were to nest near your home that your access to the beach will be limited even if the ocean is essentially your back yard. I suspect that the restrictions even limit the distance a person can be from the breeding site. I understand the intent behind this proposal, but my fear is that is that these proposed regulations will have unintended consequences. How many home owners, with beach access or otherwise, will allow a nest to remain undisturbed if it means that the bird can keep them from their home? You may have just put a bulls-eye on the very wildlife you are seeking to protect. Again, I agree, we must protect our wildlife, but rushing out and pushing through wide sweeping changes that are so long and complicated that the summary is 77 pages long, only create fear and resentment among the very residents and visitors who you need as supporters. Again I urge you to consider all of the ramifications of your proposals and give us time to find away to protect our beaches without archiving them. Do not limit beach access. Respectfully, Gina L. Stevenson Pennsville, NJ Rodanthe, NC

Correspondence ID: 13852 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Folb, Sheri
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: These are my comments relating to the Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore DEIS. "The Interim Management Plan had adequate protective measures while allowing ORV and pedestrian access. It also had public input. The judicially imposed Consent Decree had none." First let me be totally up front in my views, I am totally against what Audubon and DOW are trying to force on us. Having said that I will try my best based on the "assessment". As for the Pedestrian/ORV Routes: I disagree with the Alternative F restrictions. They far exceed what would and could be more acceptable alternatives. Specifically those set forth by the Coalition FOR Beach Access. Closures Due to Birds: I disagree with the restrictive measures presented by the NPS. Pedestrians and ORV's should have thru access available to them at all times. I agree that PP unfledged chick buffers should move with the brood as it relocates, not expanded. Large, Inflexible Buffers are not acceptable! Why does NPS not consider neighboring areas that are more conducive to the breeding and survival of these birds? Mr. Walker Golder of Audubon has stated that we (CHNRS) "don't have what the birds need." "USF&WL describe the primary constituent elements for the birds as crusted tidal mud flats where they can forage and feed. Most of CHNRS beaches are dry baron sand with vegetated dune lines that they don't prefer to nest in because of predation." Closures Due to Turtles: I do not agree with NPS's excessive restrictions. A more acceptable closure is presented by the coalition. (Closure to surf line from I hour before sunset until dawn.) Instead of around the clock closures. The frequency of human involvement resulting in nesting female deaths and/or hatching disruption or mortality has not occurred. Cultural/Historical Values: The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth by NEP A "is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resource in the federal decision making process." Why are the cultural aspects being downgraded to only two paragraphs of analysis? Shameful if not downright deceitful Socioeconomic Analysis: (pg270-281; 561 -698) I disagree with the ROI analysis used in this DEIS. The analysis used is totally irrelevant to our specific area. Certain areas such as the Northern Beach communities and Fort Raleigh National Historic Sight as well as the Wright Brothers National Memorial need to be factored out. "Economic analysis predicated on assumption of access is fundamentally flawed." Pet/Horse Restrictions: I agree with the Coalitions position of allowing pets on at least a 6-foot leash year-round in all areas open to access. Predator Management: I do not agree with NPS' s current policy of selective species eradication. - The 100+ nutria that were killed are mainly vegetarians. Why select this species? - A favorite food of the 250+ raccoons killed is ghost crabs. (Which is a bigger threat to PP chicks than any human or ORV.) Why select this species? C" A park in Florida had raccoons eliminated to protect turtle eggs. The ghost crab population exploded and they ate the eggs." Night Driving: I do not agree with banning night driving. It is more of a deterrent to predators than eliminating certain species. Thank you for your time. And hope that I have made some feasible comments. Sincerely,
Sheri Folb 47937 Buxton Back Rd Buxton NC 27920

Correspondence ID: 13853 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:34:17
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
I am an attorney with the Southern Environmental Law Center but I submit these comments as a North Carolina resident and a nature enthusiast. The outer banks are beautiful. They are not a highway.
When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness..."
There are plenty of places to drive machines that have not been reserved as primitive wilderness areas. The DEIS is disappointing. Please do a better job of protecting the public's resources when you issue the FEIS.
Sincerely, Thomas Gremillion

Correspondence ID: 13854 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: May 11, 2010
Submitted via PEPC Web site and U.S. Mail
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray:
On behalf of Disability Rights North Carolina, we write to provide comments regarding the National Park Service (NPS) Notice of Availability of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore (Seashore) Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) Management Plan (Plan) published in the Federal Register Vol. 75, No. 43, March 5, 2010.
Disability Rights North Carolina (DRNC) is North Carolina's federally mandated Protection and Advocacy (P&A) System for individuals with disabilities. Among other activities, DRNC advocates for the accessibility of government programs and services to ensure individuals with disabilities

enjoy equal opportunities in the community.

DRNC was pleased to see accessibility described on page viii of the Plan as an element common to all alternatives analyzed in the document. We offer the following comments in the hope of improving upon NPS's commitment to accessibility.

1. Page viii: Beach access points and boardwalks compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act requirements would be provided at Coquina Beach, the Frisco Boathouse, the Ocracoke Pony Pen, and the Ocracoke day use area.

DRNC encourages the National Park Service to ensure that providing ADA-compliant access points and boardwalks at only four (4) sites does not diminish overall accessibility of the Seashore. 2. Page viii: Beach access would be provided through the issuance of special use permits for areas in front of the villages to allow ORVs to transport visitors with disabilities to the beach and then return the vehicle back to the street.

While DRNC appreciates NPS's effort to accommodate visitors with disabilities via these special use permits, the scheme as proposed does not accommodate visitors with disabilities who are visiting the Seashore alone. The Plan proposes that the special use permit be used "to transport [individuals with mobility impairments] to join their family or friends on an open beach that is otherwise closed to ORV." (Page 540) This necessarily excludes individuals with mobility impairments who are able to operate their own vehicle and choose to visit the Seashore without friends or family. 3. Page viii: Beach wheelchairs could be checked out at each District on a first-come, first-served basis.

DRNC applauds the inclusion of beach wheelchairs in each of the Plan's alternatives. We hope the availability of the wheelchairs will be highly publicized and that the use of the wheelchairs will be monitored to ensure they are available for all who require them. 4. In various places, the Plan mentions restricting "pets" at certain times of the year, and in fact Alternatives D, E and F prohibit "pets" in species management areas year-round. (See, e.g., page 546) DRNC would like to highlight for NPS that Seashore visitors with disabilities may be accompanied by a trained service animal necessary for the visitor's use and enjoyment of the Seashore. A working service animal should not be considered a pet and therefore should be exempt from any such restrictions. NPS should train Seashore personnel on the use of and inquiry into the use of service animals, including training about the various uses of service animals. Service animals include not just guide dogs for people with visual impairments, but also include animals trained to assist individuals with mobility and balance impairments, seizure disorders, and hearing impairments, among others. NPS may also wish to devise a policy for granting requested reasonable accommodations to this "no pets" prohibition for individuals with disabilities who use service animals. A trained service animal of course poses little risk to the wildlife the Plan seeks to protect. 5. Several of the Plan's alternatives note the potential for a beach shuttle service. (See, e.g., page 540)

NPS should ensure any such shuttle service can accommodate riders with disabilities.

If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact Annaliese Dolph, Director of Public Policy, at 919-856-2195. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Plan.

Sincerely,

Annaliese Dolph Adrienne Allison Director of Public Policy Staff Attorney

Correspondence ID:	13855	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May.11.2010 13:34:41						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	My wife and I are residents of Elizabeth City and owners of a vacation rental house in Waes, NC on Hatteras Island. Completion of the ORV Management Plan/EIS and final implementation is important. We are commenting today to express our concern that the options contained in the latest proposals for the management plan seem to again take too much away from vacationers and thus, by default, too much away from businesses and rental property owners whose income relies on vacationers. NPS needs to define options that are more reasonable in terms of the periods of ORV closures and restrictions. NPS also needs to take a more reasonable approach to restrictions on presence of pets in park, beach and other areas used by vacationers. Protection of the at risk animals (turtles and shore birds) and beach and dunes is important, but the severe restrictions being recommended are unreasonable. Vidal and Georgene Falcon						
Correspondence ID:	13856	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May.11.2010 13:34:57						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	The closures seem to have lumped all beach access under a single term called "ORV Access". While I may not agree with closing the beaches to ORV access, I understand that there may be a need that should be driven by science. Since I am not an expert I have to hope that the politics of closing the beaches to ORV traffic is done fairly and for the right reasons. My comment today is how the closures to ORV access also impacts pedestrian traffic on the beaches. The 2 groups of people are different categories and should be treated differently. I understand the need for protecting the environment, I just think we need to treat pedestrians access differently than ORV access.						
Correspondence ID:	13857	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	
Name:	Folb, Frank						
Received:	May.05.2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Letter						
Correspondence:	I completely disagree with NPS's DEIS. This document is more restrictive than the consent decree, which is also totally unacceptable!! On page 210 of the DEIS, NPS claims that "protected species are still at risk" from pedestrians and ORV's. When in fact NPS has no proof of deaths of piping plovers by pedestrian or ORV's And the only death attributed to humans, on a shorebird, was the death of an oyster catcher chick by NPS resource management and biologists while attempting to tag a chick!! The unsuccessful fledge rate of shorebirds on Hatteras Island is due to predation and weather and has nothing to do with pedestrians or ORV's Closures due to Birds: NPS's closures are excessive!! 1000 meter closures for unfledged chicks is approx. 771 sq. miles for 1 or 2 piping plover chicks. Large overly excessive closures for nesting and unfledged shorebirds that are not on the endangered species list are also unacceptable. The science used to come up with these closure sizes is not peer reviewed. Socioeconomic Impact on the 8 villages located in Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore: The Economic Impact of the DEIS on our villages has not been looked at by the NPS. NPS has used Dare County as their model and this does not nor will it ever give a clear account of the effects that the DEIS will have on Hatteras Island villages. The DEIS is 800+ pages of misinformation, biased and non-peer reviewed science with only 2 paragraphs on the socioeconomic Impact on the Villages in CHNRS. This document is NOT acceptable!! Sincerely, Frank Folb Jr PO Box 940 Buxton, NC 27920 252-995-4153						
Correspondence ID:	13858	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	
Name:	Dineen, S						
Received:	May.05.2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Letter						
Correspondence:	Greetings to all. I attended the DEIS session in Kitty Hawk at the Wright Brothers Pavilion on April 27th 2010. I was so moved by the true American Democratic Process in the works. For two hours we listened to speaker after speaker talk from the heart about their love and commitment to the people, the nature and the beaches, of the Outer Banks most notably Hatteras National Seashore. The speakers were both eloquent with their delivery and knowledgeable with their content. They justified-with data ~ science -and pure-emotion the essence of their concerns. I was moved to tears during some of the deliveries. We listened to fishermen, surfers, residents, business owners and politicians express their feelings. The one message that came thru the						

loudest over and over again was the need to consider the environmental and economical impact on We the people, on the lives of American Citizens and their way of life. Little by little Government is witting away at what makes this country great as we eliminate one industry after another and sacrifice our Independence. Hatteras Seashore has revenue generating industries that should not be sacrificed at this time or ever. They have tourism and a fishing industry that is hard to rival. Yet the National Park Service run by the Federal Government is up for yet another power grab. Statistics show that relocation of nests for endangered birds and turtles are by far the best alternative especially in the Outer Banks Environment where severe storms are the biggest threat to both wildlife and humans. Why is it that I feel raped by our government once again in a deal that is unequivocally dirty to the core? We are literally destroying our economy piece by piece thru unprecedented spending and taxation with no regard to maintaining the means that generate income, not only for the individual but for the country. If the National Park Service continues to pursue the path of blocking beach access and use by the local people and tourists, that love and support the area, I can only conclude that their motives are insensitive and foolish. One would be hard pressed to understand how they are able to sleep at night knowing that they have been responsible for destroying the deeply rooted, historic, beautiful and amazing culture of the Outer Banks of North Carolina. Sincerely, S. Dineen

Correspondence ID: 13859 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: greene, tammie b
Received: May,11,2010 13:37:10
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My family has visited the following major national parks: Everglades, Great Smoky Mountains, Grand Canyon, Zion, Monument Valley, Yellowstone, Grand Tetons and Glacier along with many minor parks, preserves, etc. We did not just drive by these parks; we spent days exploring them. Never have we witnessed the draconian measures that have been forced on the visitors to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and that are being proposed now. The measures proposed are a threat to the original intent when this area was designated and a threat to the mission of the national park system. Cape Hatteras National Seashore was designated as a recreational area, not as a wildlife refuge. Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge (with 5,834 acres land and 25,700 acres water) was established at approximately the same time for that purpose. Alligator River National Wildlife Refuge 154,000 acres. When combined with our other area wildlife refuges such as Mattamuskeet, our area has more acreage dedicated to preservation of wildlife than to people. "When we look up and down the ocean fronts of America, we find that everywhere they are passing behind the fences of private ownership. The people can no longer get to the ocean. When we have reached the point that a nation of 125 million people cannot set foot upon the thousands of miles of beaches that border the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, except by permission of those who monopolize the ocean front, then I say it is the prerogative and the duty of the Federal and State Governments to step in and acquire, not a swimming beach here and there, but solid blocks of ocean front hundreds of miles in length. Call this ocean front a national park, or a national seashore, or a state park or anything you please? I say that the people have a right to a fair share of it." Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes, 1938
 Would he have ever believed that our own federal government and special interest groups would be the ones stopping citizens from stepping foot on our beaches? Educate yes. Issue permits for beach driving yes. Reduce access NO.

Correspondence ID: 13860 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Graham, John D
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
 1) Page xxiv: I question the DEIS statement that "Carrying capacity would be a peak use limit" determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront..." If large sections of beach are closed, visitors will migrate to smaller remaining areas. Thus the resource could potentially be more greatly impaired and the visitor experience diminished.
 2)Page xix and page 23: I disagree with having different closures for north-facing beaches and south-facing beaches as described on the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I also disagree with the NS proposal to close the beaches in Frisco, Hatteras, and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all Villages. Please maintain the May 15 to September 15 dates.
 3)Page 1: I agree with the statement that "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors." However, if areas are designated as pedestrian only areas, people with handicaps such as aging or physical impairments, will not be able to engage in activities requiring equipment like boggy boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc.
 4)Page 1: I disagree with the way the DEIS addresses cultural resource issues. I do not feel the DEIS properly addresses the cultural resource issues. The purpose as set forth in the DEIS is to protect and preserve the natural and cultural resources, yet only Two Paragraphs in the 810 Page Document are devoted to analysis of the cultural issues.
 5)Page 53: I disagree with the concept of the special use guidelines. It would be impractical and would require twice the beach driving to transport a handicapped person to the beach, return to a parking area, walk back onto the beach, then when ready to leave , walk back out to the parking lot, drive in, pick up the handicapped person, and drive back out. This is not to mention, if an emergency occurs while the transport vehicle is in the parking area with no immediate access to it, the handicapped person may be in jeopardy.
 6)Pages 97-101: I strongly disagree with the proposal to prohibit ORV year round between ramps 27 and 30 at Hatteras inlet(Hatteras Spit) , Ocracoke Inlet(North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations. Not permitting ORV access to the areas virtually denies public access to these areas since it is miles to the nearest parking area or road and too far to access by foot.
 7)Page 104: I disagree with the proposed prohibition of nighttime driving from May 1 to November 15 forcing visitors off the beaches early preventing early morning fishing. A more moderate schedule of an hour before sunset and an hour before sunrise would be more appropriate.
 8)Page 121: I disagree with the proposal to close beaches, including pedestrians, from March 15 to July 31 at eight locations which have traditionally been available. Please, at least, leave these open for beach walkers, shell pickers, and those who want access to these beaches.
 9)Page 124: I disagree with the NPS proposals that over protect the resource at the expense of the public right to access the beaches. A proactive role to include vegetation management, habitat management, predator management, etc. should be activated. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures should be considered more frequently than every 5 years.
 10)Pages 121-127: I strongly disagree with the proposed buffer zones as proposed. Pass through corridors should be provided to allow access from one area to another. There are areas between buffer zones that are effectively closed because there is no way to get to them if the beach is totally closed above and below them. The 1000 meter buffer for the piping plover is way too extensive. Scientific evidence shows 200 meters is adequate. The proposed 300 meter buffer for other species such as the American Oystercatcher, Least Tern, and Colonial Waterbirds should also be reduced from 300 meters to 30 meters. Non-endanger species should not have the same protection as those that are endangered.
 11)Pages 125, 392-396: I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. Sea turtles would benefit from better management practices to achieve better nesting success including relocating nests to more desirable locations as done at other state and federally controlled areas.
 12)Page 136: I very strongly disagree with the proposed pet restrictions. the prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages essentially prohibits pets in public areas-beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads-from March 15 until July 31. I own a home that I rent as a pet permitted house. The proposed regulations would effectively cost me at least One half of my potential rentals since the regulations would encompass the rental season. If people do come with pets and be forced by the regulations to leave their pets in the house for extended periods, I would have damage to the house while they are out, which would result in financial loss to me.
 13)Page 201: I disagree that plover deaths are a result of ORV violations. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. The transgressions into protected areas are a result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement rather than public purposely and willfully violating the

protected areas.

14)Page 486: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Pass through corridors should be provided through, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during the entire breeding season.

15) I disagree with the overall visitor counts presented. Overall visitor counts in the DEIS appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the northern beaches communities and do not recreate on the National Seashore. They should not be included in Seashore stats. The atmosphere in the Kitty Hawk-Nags head area is one of large box stores and fast food, not the Nature Loving Visitors of the Seashore area.

16) I disagree with the socioeconomic analysis presented. All socioeconomic analysis related to Alternative F for the of the Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke areas is based on the assumption that access corridors will be maintained for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to resource closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, the economic analysis based on the assumption of access is fundamentally flawed.

17) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian/ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival. Using NPS numbers, human interference is just 3% of the problem where natural influences such as mammalian predation, storm/lunar tides, nest abandonment, avian predation, and ghost crab predation make up the other 97%. Human interference is insignificant.

18) I disagree with the NPS stats that do not consider adjacent areas to the Seashore such as spoil islands that were created as waterways are dredged. These areas are covered with birds of all sorts and should be considered in the same ecosystem.

Conclusion: Please incorporate access corridors through all SMAs so we can get to open beaches. Base you buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances.

The proposals do not adequately protect the human element that is involved at this location. Over restriction of human activities does not help protect the other ecosystems involved. A proper balance of regulations will stimulate humans to respect this area that is the visited by nature loving individuals.

Correspondence ID: 13861 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Kilmer, Kathy

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: May 11, 2010

Mr. Jon Jarvis Director National Park Service Washington, DC

Please accept this comment letter from The Wilderness Society and thousands of our members and supporters. The Wilderness Society alerted our members and supporters to your request for comments on the Cape Hatteras off-road vehicle plan. 16,000 of our members and supporters responded to our alert and submitted a letter to Mr. Murray supporting the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D (modified to provide greater pedestrian access). Many of those who commented made an extra effort to expand on their experiences and their desired outcomes in the rule-making. After our members and supporters sent letters supporting our position, I was surprised to find those comments would be rejected because they didn't meet technical requirements set out by the Park Service for the comment process.

We have numerous times provided comments on CDs to other Interior agencies, because presently we have no way of submitting these comments via a web-form. While use of web-forms may make sense from the agency's point of view, they can make it more difficult for your constituency? Americans who cherish and want to care for their national parks? to engage with the Service on policy issues.

Other federal agencies have been quite receptive to comments via CD, as they prove to be in a format that makes it easy to sort and file the data. I urge you to open your comment processes to include public input submitted via CD? or via email? so that more people may participate in public comment.

I am appreciative of Mr. Murray notifying us promptly that our CD could not be accepted, but because our members and supporters who commented about Cape Hatteras did so believing their comments would reach the Park Service, I am sending to Mr. Jarvis a CD of their comments for your consideration. We regret this situation and respectfully request that the Park Service take note of the 16,000 comments from our member and supporters --your constituents.

Below is the letter that our members and supporters used as the basis of their comments to the NPS regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Kathy Kilmer Director Electronic Communications The Wilderness Society 1615 M St, NW Washington, DC 20036

Cc: Mike Murray, Supervisor, Cape Hatteras National Park

Mike Murray Superintendent, Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13862 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Johnson, Richard

Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: RE: Public Comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) As a Dare County Commissioner, I strongly support access to the beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area consistent with the promises made in the enabling legislation. The residents and visitors to Dare County have always been faithful stewards of wildlife. For generations our people have lived in harmony with nature. Our people have a genuine interest in making sure that nature thrives in our area in order to preserve it for future generations. In fact, the greatest threat to nature in our area is weather related events and predators. People are not the enemy of wildlife. I support resource protection that is based on transparent, peer-reviewed science. But, I also believe that resource protection must be balanced with providing people reasonable access for family recreation. In addressing the DE IS, I believe there are several areas that need modification before release of a final environmental impact statement later this year. These areas include: ? Need for corridors ? Reasonable buffers ? Modified protection for non-endangered birds ? More proactive management practices for sea

turtles

Issue DEIS Alternative F Page # Park Service Preferred Dare County Position which I Support Corridors xli Corridors are only Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while xviii allowed in ML-2 managing resources. They provide a small path 468 portions of SMA's around temporary resource closures in order to provide and are subject to access to open area that would otherwise be blocked. resource closures at any time Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMA's. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources Management 121-127 Buffers (closures) are Buffers, or closures, are important management Buffers larger than required practices for species recovery. However, to have long by species recovery term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, plans. buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, Piping For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as Plover unfledged threatened and not endangered, is given a level of chicks, are given a unprecedented protection in Alternative F. protective buffer of a minimum of 1,000 A 1,000 meter buffer in all directions represents over meters in all 771 acres. The DE IS does not cite any peer-reviewed directions. science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters Non- 121-127 Non-endangered Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be Endangered species, such as afforded the level of protection given to ESA Birds American (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead Oystercatchers, of 300 meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate Least Terns and buffer would be 30 meters Colonial Waterbirds are given Pre-Nesting Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore closures and buffers should be counted . This includes all the many birds on up to 300 meters the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. Turtle 125 The National Park Service should consider turtle Management 392-396 DEIS claims North management practices successfully used in other Carolina Wildlife federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. Resources Commission turtle More proactive measures include relocating nests to guidelines will be more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas. Sincerely, Richard Johnson, D re Nests County Commissioner

Correspondence ID: 13863 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Weidner, Laura
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: May 11, 2010
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Re: Comments on the draft Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (plan/EIS)
Dear Superintendant Murray:
On behalf of the more than 400,000 Americans living with multiple sclerosis (MS), the National MS Society would like to comment on the draft Cape Hatteras National Seashore Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (plan/EIS) published by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on March 12, 2010. The National MS Society certainly understands and respects the desire to develop regulations and procedures that carefully manage ORV use/access in the Seashore to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources and processes. The options presented, however, appear to not fully take into account the special and unique circumstances of people living with multiple sclerosis and other disabilities. The National MS Society therefore strongly urges that regardless of which alternative is selected, the National Park Service thoroughly review the strategy from a disability perspective and remove rather than create barriers to physical accessibility; prevent discrimination; and promote independence.
Multiple sclerosis (MS) is an often disabling, autoimmune disease affecting the central nervous system. The progress, severity, and specific symptoms of MS are unpredictable and vary from one person to another. MS can cause blurred vision, loss of balance, poor coordination, slurred speech, tremors, numbness, extreme fatigue, problems with memory and concentration, paralysis, blindness and more. These problems may be permanent or may come and go. The National MS Society is a collective of passionate individuals who want to do something about MS now?to move together toward a world free of multiple sclerosis. The Society is the largest nonprofit organization in the United States supporting research for the treatment, prevention and cure of multiple sclerosis.
More than 5,000 people living with MS reside in eastern North Carolina and many others around the country living with MS visit the Cape Hatteras region year round for vacation and personal enjoyment. Several aspects of the plan/EIS are troubling and would present significant obstacles for people living with MS. For instance, special use permits would be required to transport people with disabilities to the beach and then the vehicle must be returned to the street. If a person living with MS is fortunate to be traveling with a companion or caretaker, this requirement could still prove problematic if the individual must remain alone for any period of time and the individual's symptoms are severe and for instance, include loss of balance, paralysis, blurred vision, or blindness. People living with MS traveling to Cape Hatteras alone may also encounter extreme difficulty if they are forced to park far away from ADA accessible access points and his or her symptoms are severe in nature. Having to travel even a short distance when experiencing intense fatigue, tremors, loss of balance, vision problems, or memory issues can be an enormous burden which runs counter to Cape Hatteras's purpose of a place of enjoyment for all.
The plan/EIS indicates that four ADA compliant beach access points will be provided for persons living with disabilities. Cape Hatteras consists of more than 30,000 acres distributed along approximately 68 miles of shoreline, making a mere four ADA-compliant access points a fairly significant barrier for people living with MS attempting to fully participate in recreation and/or enjoyment of Cape Hatteras's offerings.
The National MS Society also finds distinctly troubling the considerable restrictions placed on "pets" by each of the alternatives, whether prohibited in certain areas or during certain seasons. The current policy for Cape Hatteras is that "[g]uide dogs for the visually impaired are permitted to remain with their owners at all times." People living with MS or other disabilities may very well rely on assistance animals not only for specific guide purposes, but also for providing balance support, pulling wheelchairs, alerting to sounds, or responding to changes in the physiological, mental, or emotional state of their human partners. People living with MS and other disabilities needing help from assistance animals simply must not be denied their presence, guidance, and comfort at any location in Cape Hatteras or during any time of year.
The National MS Society thanks you for the opportunity to comment on the plan/EIS and truly hopes that moving forward, the needs of people living with MS and other disabilities are met. Should you have any questions, please contact Shawn O'Neil, Vice President of Federal Government Relations at 202-408-1500. Every individual should be able to lead a full, productive life and participate in community activities such as the full enjoyment of Cape Hatteras. The National Multiple Sclerosis Society is dedicated to the removal of barriers and hope that you will work with us so that all people with MS can live with as much independence and self-sufficiency as possible.
Sincerely,
Shawn O'Neil Vice President Federal Government Relations

Correspondence ID: 13864 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Sutton, Alan & Melinda
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Superintendent Murray,
We recommend that any ORV permits required be made easily available to the vacationing, visiting public. Requiring permits to be purchased days in advance or at limited NPS locations will cause severe adverse economic impacts to businesses in the region. Permits must be made available both in person and on-line. Today's technology allows customers to expect immediate results. We are extremely concerned that ifORV permits are only available at NPS visitor centers then there is no incentive to satisfy the public. As the owners of a tackle shop in one of the seashore villages, we understand the implications and logistical issues surrounding the NC Saltwater fishing licensing requirement. Although customers may accept that permits and licenses are required, there is no tolerance for bureaucracy by the vacationing public. In order to sell fishing tackle and earn a paycheck, we MUST ensure that we always have the state-issued paper available, an active internet connection, and extended store hours. Otherwise, the customer does not receive a license, and (unlike a visitor center federal employee) we do not earn a paycheck. We suggest that ifORV permits are required in the seashore, that the administration of the permits be tied into the secure NC DMF saltwater license website www.ncalvin.org and administered by NC Fish & Wildlife. This will significantly reduce NPS costs and allow ORV permit buyers a reasonably accessible alternative to NPS sites. Duplicating

effort with a second website will only foster visitor frustration over governmental bureaucracy. Finally, it should be stated that any fees collected through a permit system must be used to maintain or increase OR V access. Sincerely, Alan and Melinda Sutton Tradewinds Tackle PO Box 388 Ocracoke, NC 27960

Correspondence ID: 13865 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 13:40:49
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV.
Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.
In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.

Correspondence ID: 13866 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 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 designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving the best examples of America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. I look forward to seeing an improved final ORV management plan.

Correspondence ID: 13867 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 13:42:22
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, Mary Toon

Correspondence ID: 13868 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Fodrie, Melinda
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: Superintendent Murray,
I strongly disagree with DEIS economic data being derived from the Fort Raleigh/Wright Brothers Memorial visitors. There is immense diversity within the seashore. The region depends on different visitors in different parts of the seashore and at different times of year. As a native NC resident, 25 year visitor to Cape Hatteras Seashore, 12 year Ocracoke property resident, and 6 year permanent Ocracoke resident, I can testify that I have NEVER been to Fort Raleigh or Wright Brothers parks. These locations have nothing in common with the critical seashore points, spits, and inlets that are only accessible by ORV. Suggesting that the visiting public at Ocracoke Island is similar, or could produce reasonable economic data to the visitors of these northern non-ORV locations, is severely flawed. The spring and fall visitors to Ocracoke Island come here for the ability to access the points and spits at Hatteras and Ocracoke Inlets. OR V access to these areas is critical, as it allows visitors to bring their fishing rods, surfboards, beach chairs, and beach toys. These areas are enjoyed by families looking for experiences different from those offered elsewhere in the seashore. Without OR V access to these areas, the spring and fall visitors do not come. Without ORV access to the points and spits, potential visitors vacation at beaches that are easier to access

0012629

and offer greater diversity of activities, such as Emerald Isle or Kitty Hawk. I suggest that any final OR V plan be postponed until complete and accurate economic data is available. I also suggest that the DEIS reflect that the visiting public at Ocracoke Island during spring and fall months show the actual dependence on ORV seashore access. Sincerely, Melinda Fodrie POBox 1025 Ocracoke, NC 27960

Correspondence ID: 13869 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Sutton, Alan & Melinda
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: We disagree with the ORV closure at the north end of Ocracoke. This area has not had any significant breeding pairs of shorebirds, and it is a critical area for recreational fishermen. Closing this area to OR V's and setting it aside as pedestrian-only will not enhance the pedestrian visitor's experience. We have no doubt that complaints occur from pedestrian users that there are not adequate pedestrian-only surf locations. However, these complaints are NOT due to inadequate pedestrian-only seashore. These complaints are generated by the non-existent education and communication offered by NPS on what locations are available for what type of use. We have stopped hundreds of 2wd motorists entering the seashore at 4wd ramps. We have discussed access with thousands of pedestrians at our store. NONE of them have ever complained to us about the lack of pedestrian-only access, because we have explained where this access is and how to get there. NPS does not post adequate maps or explanations on where the pedestrian-only access areas are, which naturally results in complaints. To enhance the visitor experience of pedestrians at the seashore, NPS must improve its signage and communications. Closing more beach miles to ORV's only improves the odds that a pedestrian accidentally happens upon pedestrian-only access areas while penalizing OR V users. Beach ramps must ensure OR V access throughout the critical spring and fall fishing seasons to prevent severe adverse economic impacts. The only beachfront areas that should be pedestrian-only are the pony pens year-round, the campground area seasonally while open, and the lifeguard beach seasonally. The ENTIRE sound-side area of Ocracoke is already a pedestrian-only access location, as NPS has continually failed to provide any ORV access. In addition, maintaining corridors through any closed area is critical. Any management plan that potentially allows closed areas of beach without OR V corridors is creating severe adverse socioeconomic impacts. Sincerely, Alan and Melinda Sutton Tradewinds Tackle POBox 388 Ocracoke, NC 27960

Correspondence ID: 13870 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:44:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My wife and I own a property in Avon, NC. We would like to submit public comments on the Alternative "F" plan for the ORV Management plan: 1. We agree with the restriction "No pet, ?, will be permitted,?, on Cape Hatteras National seashore public lands including the beaches between March 15th and July 31st." (p.136) We have never seen any animals there leashed. 2. We agree with the proposed restriction placed on ORV as described on pages 97-101, and 104. We are always saddened to see the vehicle tire marks all over the beach every time we go down there to visit.

Correspondence ID: 13871 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Gaidos, Carol H
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Mike Murray, Supt. Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
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,
Carol H Gaidos

Correspondence ID: 13872 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Spalding, Richard
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Respectfully, Richard F. Spalding 108 Gray Mares Ln Cary, NC 27518

Correspondence ID: 13873 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.
1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas.
2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience.
3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15.
4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors."
However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and

tackle, etc)

5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle.

Suppose the handicapped person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well.

6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends.

I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection.

Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded.

The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer.

Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial

Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS.

NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches.

7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.

9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events.

Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%,

So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles.

10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included.

Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park.

11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues.

12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore.

? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages

? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.

? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI.

On page xlvi, Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement.

I have owned a rental beach house on Hatteras Island for nearly thirty years and am fortunate that I no longer have a mortgage but there are several thousand rental houses on the island and I estimate that at least have of these "small businesses" have sizeable mortgages and the economic viability of these businesses depends upon booking renters for at least 20 - 30 weeks per year to remain viable. Why do people rent houses on the island? For fishing and other beach activities in the National Park. I believe the restrictive rules of the DEIS will significantly limit rentals and will bring about the foreclosure of many mortgages and the collapse of the rental business. This is not adequately considered in your economic analysis.

Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules.

(p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible.

13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out.

Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed.

Why would a group of surf fishermen want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS.

14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31.

15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from

management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection.

16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations.

Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years. 17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ? September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area.

Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates.

18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas.

Conclusion:

Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed.

It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area.

Let's scale back the buffer zones. The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved.

I do not understand why you have chosen Alternative F, the most restrictive and user unfriendly of all of the Alternatives that have been studied.

Thank you,

Donald A. Delwiche

Correspondence ID: 13874 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Jeanne, Sykes

Received: May,11,2010 13:45:30

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I do not agree with alternative F of the DEIS. I do agree with the position that the Dare County Board of Directors have taken. It is my opinion after visiting Hatteras numerous times that the Hatteras Island residents economy has already suffered greatly because of beach closings. Additional restrictions to beach access would harm their lively hood even more. This is so unnecessary when there are other alternatives. The corridors to access open areas should not be compromised. Species not listed on the endangered list should not have protective status. The buffer for the unfledged piping plover chick should not be excessive and the relocation of the sea turtle nests should be used as a means of their management. Please do not pass alternative F of the DEIS. Please keep our beaches in OUR National Seashore open and accessible!

Correspondence ID: 13875 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Murray, Mike

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.

I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.

Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Sincerely, Juanita Spehknouch 175 Cooley Ridge Dr. Sykesville, MD 21784

Correspondence ID: 13876 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Ammirati, Lisa

Received: May,11,2010 13:46:54

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My husband and I moved to NC 5 years ago. One draw for my husband was the proximity to the pristine beaches of the Outer Banks/ Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We visited and were stunned at the driving on the beach. It seemed counterintuitive; it was dangerous - people were driving these gigantic ORVs, enormous larger-than-life sized tires, tearing up the beach and racing each other, trying to overtake each other as if on the highway. On the occasion there was someone coming in the opposite direction of two hyped up fools racing on the beach, the near misses for the walking public were too close for comfort. We were horrified. This pretty much killed our desire to be around that area again.

Not to mention what it could have possibly done to the wildlife...the damage must have been immense.

No one on this planet has an inherent right to anything. All the blather about "rights" of access to public beaches regardless of the outcome is only realistic and viable to a point. When the 'rights' of the minority (insane drivers) overtake and crush the 'rights' of the majority (walkers, naturalists, wildlife)...something is seriously flawed.

Please restrict or continue to restrict full access to these beaches.

Correspondence ID: 13877 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Sutton, Alan

Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: I disagree with the statement:

"May 1 to Nov 15: Designated ORV routes in potential sea turtle nesting habitat (ocean intertidal zone, ocean backshore, and dunes) would be closed to non-essential ORV use from 1 hour after sunset until turtle patrol has checked the beach in the morning (by approx. one-half hour after sunrise)." ORV night-time access has not disrupted sea turtle nesting or sea turtle nesting productivity. Nesting females have not been killed, nests have not been lost due to human activity, and hatchlings have not suffered. Light disorientation makes no scientific sense when you look at the number of turtle nests in high density developed areas such as Myrtle Beach or southern Florida that have much higher light pollution. Turtle nests fail due to weather, as shown by NPS records. In fact, the USGS Protocols state on page 77 that turtle nests do well when the weather is good, and they do poorly when the weather is bad. These events are independent of ORV or pedestrian activity. Turtle nests in low areas should be relocated immediately to ensure turtle hatchling success and visitor access. At the very least, a special night-time use permit for the May 1 to Nov 15 dates should be made available to drum fishermen and star gazers. These two user groups are actually more light sensitive than the sea turtles. Star gazers require the low light pollution made available by the seashore area. . . Red drum, North Carolina's state fish, is extremely sensitive to any light (or shadows) 'cast onto the night-time ocean water. This

light sensitivity is a large reason why the Cape Hatteras Seashore area is so critical to drum fishermen. There are very few if any locations along the east coast, even those locations that have better sea turtle nesting results that offer the low light pollution required by drum fishermen. Drum fishermen are extremely careful to never shine their truck lights along the water edge for fear of disturbing the drum or causing light blindness in a fellow fisherman. These fishermen do not cause any light disturbance to potential nesting sea turtles. In fact, star gazers and drum fishermen are the responsible user groups that can help mitigate the administrative costs of monitoring the seashore for nesting turtles and nighttime activity. Their nighttime access to the seashore is not only reasonable but should be desired by an actively managed seashore. If a special use permit is deemed required, a requirement could be the reporting of any turtle crawl activity. I suggest that drum fishermen and star gazers be allowed year-round 24 access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Sincerely, Alan Sutton POBox 1025 Ocracoke, NC 27960

Correspondence ID: 13878 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: tileston, susan a
Received: May,11,2010 13:47:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: i have not been to cape hatteras in a long time, but i still remember the beautifull beaches and sand dunes. I hate to think about what kind of damage wheeled vehicles could do to the beaches!!! I think that cape hatteras should remain a protected wildlife area. the U.S.A.is loosing too many wild areas and especially beaches to development already!!!

Correspondence ID: 13879 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Spehnkouch, Scott
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Scott Spehnkouch 175 Cooley Ridge Dr. Sykesville, Md 21784

Correspondence ID: 13880 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Sutton, Alan
Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Letter
Correspondence: I disagree with the buffer distances proposed in the DEIS.
A 1000m unfledged piping plover chick closure distance closes as many acres to visitor use as the entire village of Ocracoke, a community that pays over half of Hyde County taxes. The 300m and 200m closure distances for other shorebirds are unneeded and unjustified. The 300m and 200m closures close 70 and 31 acres respectively. More importantly, Ocracoke Island only has about 100m to 150m of beachfront access available from the water's edge to the dunes, so these buffer distances reflect a COMPLETE closure of the entire seashore for non-endangered species. I recommend the plover buffer distances used by Assateague Island and approved by the April 15, 1994 US Fish & Wildlife Study for actively managed piping plover unfledged chicks. This distance is a minimum of 100m and suggested 200m for the plover nest of unfledged chicks. Per the US Fish & Wildlife study, this distance requires an active management plan, which is consistent with the active management requirements found in plan F. And a 100m to 200m buffer for unfledged piping plover chicks is consistent with common sense. The greatest distance that a plover nest had been found to move in the 1994 US Fish & Wildlife study was 900m, which has caused some proponents of the 1000m buffer. But the US Fish & Wildlife study only recommends this distance for a nest that is not managed. The plover broods do not migrate these large distances except as the brood completes hatching and searches for proper foraging habitat. Once the brood finds suitable foraging habitat it travels little. Prior to hatching the nest is not moving at all. I recommend that DEIS proposal F have an active management plan for piping plover unfledged chicks and change the buffer distance from 1 000m to 200m accordingly. Since the piping plover nests will be actively managed, I recommend that the buffer distance be no more than 50m for the piping plover breeding activity and nest prior to hatching. The closure distance can be increased to the 100m minimum as the nest approaches its hatch window. Other shorebirds require much less buffer distances than the endangered piping plover. Assateague Island management has found that terns and AMOY's require no special buffers, as most of their nesting typically occurs within the piping plovers 200m buffer. In fact, one AMOY pair nests yearly next to HWY 12 outside of Hatteras village as motorists pass by at 50mph. These birds are obviously not disturbed by OR V's or pedestrians. In addition, terns are known to nest on shopping center rooftops in the adjacent Kitty Hawk/Nags Head area. Any seashore closures that impede visitor use are unjustified and unnecessary for these species. I agree with a sound-side pre-nesting closure at Southpoint Ocracoke, provided it maintains beachfront access and a corridor during any potential nesting closures. The mudflats found in this area are critical habitat for shorebirds, and closing these areas (as long as the beachfront remains open) will not cause extreme economic impact. Other sound-side shorefront should be made available north of the pony pens to mitigate the sound-side closures in the Southpoint area. But the Southpoint area sound-side mudflats are ideal habitat for the shorebirds, and a closure in this area should satisfy any requirements for species protected areas. In no case could anything larger than a reasonable buffer of not more than 30m around nests and unfledged chicks be justified for AMOY's, Wilson's Plovers, Least Terns, or other Colonial Waterbirds. And, I disagree with any area on Ocracoke being designated (MLI). Currently, DEIS Alternative F lists north Ocracoke and ramp 68 to ramp 70 areas as SMA's with MLI. All seashore areas are critical to visitor experience and must be actively managed (ML2) to prevent severe economic hardship to Ocracoke village. If funding is required to ensure ML2 status the ORV permit fees should be used. Sincerely, Alan Sutton POBox 1025 Ocracoke, NC 27960

Correspondence ID: 13881 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Spehnkouch, Thomas
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Thomas spehnkouch 175 Cooley Ridge Dr. Sykesville, Md 21784

Correspondence ID: 13882 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kiser, Roy J
Received: May,11,2010 13:50:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV.
Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.
In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.

Correspondence ID: 13883 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lewis, Fred W
Received: May,11,2010 13:51:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I've been coming to the Outer Banks since I was a small kid, and I've always realised the need to respect and coexist with the wildlife and as long as I've been able to drive have always followed the rules and regs of the park. As a matter of fact, I've called NPS on more than a few times to report violators for speeding, donuts, in general stupid behavior on the beach. I've also reported illegal fish poaching, oversize, undersize, exceeding legal limits etc., to NCDMF as well.
That being said, my opinion on a few of the issues are as follows:
1. While I understand some changes have to be made in the park, I would like to see a little more concern as to how this is going to affect Humans rather than how it going to protect some species of birds that aren't even listed as "endangered".
2. I STRONGLY disagree with the NPS decision to NOT clear the vegetation around the pond at Cape Point, thus giving the Piping Plovers a chance to elude predation, nest far from Human presence, protect nests from overwash due to storms, high tides, etc. In other words give them the best chance at survival they have. I don't subscribe to the belief that Humans pose the most risks these animals face, I believe the biggest risk they face is Mother Nature herself. Cape Hatteras is a constantly changing spit of sand at the mercy of the sea.
3. I STRONGLY disagree with the NPS policy on killing some animals to save others. This is Man playing God at it's worst in my opinion. Also, I believe a Human presence on the beach helps to deter predation simply by being there.
4. I have made many friends in in the Outer Banks in the 40+ years I've been coming and I worry about them surviving down there with the severe restrictions I believe are coming. It's disconcerting that I always used to worry about Hurricanes, noreasters and so forth and now I'm worried about their own Government making it so hard to make a living they'll have to leave the land they love.
5. Pea Island Wildlife Refuge is just that, a Wildlife Refuge. Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a National Park. I believe Parks are for people to enjoy. Not to allow people to destroy wildlife, but to enjoy themselves. I have not seen people run over turtles, piping plovers, or any other form of wildlife down there in 40+ years, so I don't understand the need for such draconian measures now.
As I said, I understand changes are coming soon and I will abide by the rules and regs, but if things change drastically my family and I will just find somewhere else to go to fish, windsurf, and kayak. If my dog is not welcome in the park, then I'll have no choice anyway as he is a part of the family and goes where we go.
Good luck and I hope you make the right decision,
Fred Lewis freddrum@verizon.net

Correspondence ID: 13884 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:52:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to provide greater pedestrian access.
This alternative plan would provide more opportunity for non-ORV uses of the beaches and result in less disturbance of wildlife, which are important to me.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13885 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:52:28
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed plan to manage ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Of the alternative plans presented in the draft environmental impact statement, I support the identified "environmentally preferred" Alternative D if modified to

provide greater pedestrian access.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13886 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 13:52:28

Correspondence Type: Web Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13887 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service 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. As a long time visitor to the Outer Banks and as a person who favors conservation of natural resources and respect for wildlife, I feel that all six of these proposals are over reaching by various degrees and ultimately do not provide a reasonable solution or compromise of a common sense nature. The Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement is the closest alternative to a true, sensible alternative. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13888 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Sutton, Alan

Received: May,05,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Letter

Correspondence: I disagree with the statement: "There would be 1.0 mile of 'floating' ocean shoreline area for nonbreeding shorebirds. Area would be bypassed via the OR V corridor on the upper beach during nonbreeding season." found on page 101 under Alternative F, Oceanside Location 0.5 mile southwest of ramp 72 to inlet (Species Management Area). On page 124 Nonbreeding Shorebird SMAs Ocean Shoreline Areas state: "If resource protection staff determines that any single activity or collection of activities is negatively impacting shorebird use of a specific location, the NPS may implement additional restrictions on compatible activities." These statements allow for OR V access, and visitor use experiences, to be restricted and potentially eliminated year-round, if they are found to be "negatively impacting shorebird use". This is inconsistent with the assumption that alternative F socioeconomic impacts "would be long-term negligible to minor adverse or beneficial ..." found on page 145. As someone that was asked for economic consequences of closures, I can assure you that Ocracoke "Southpoint" is NOT defined as the specific location where the ocean and inlet shorelines meet. Southpoint is the term that visitors and business owners use to define the 2.5 mile area from ramp 72 to the inlet and along the inlet. Restricting access throughout any of this shoreline area will SEVERELY affect the socioeconomics of the region. Fishing the shoreline from ramp 72 to the inlet is unique as compared to the entire continental US east coast. Nowhere else from central Florida through New England do Gulf Stream waters push this close to the beach. Wintertime water temperatures are typically 5 to 10 degrees warmer in this area than anywhere else on Ocracoke or Hatteras Islands. I have watched these beachfront warm water phenomena, and the fish that it attracts, for 20 years. These warm winter waters allow locals and a small number of visitors to catch puppy drum from December through March. Although the economic impact of restricting access through this area during winter months may be small, the cultural impact of restricting access through this area would be severe during winter months. Ocracoke residents have historically cooked "drum stew", and local recipes and history highlight how unique this is to the area. Potentially limiting fishing access to this unique area would be

devastating to the culture of Ocracoke village. Most of the entire sound-side mudflats are already closed year-round for nesting and non breeding shorebirds. These flats and sound-side shoreline are closed to OR V's, pedestrians, and any visitor experience. This closed area accounts for well over half of the Southpoint area. An additional closure for nonbreeding shorebirds, aside from the sound-side mudflats, is NOT NEEDED. I recommend that the 1.0 mile of floating nonbreeding shorebird area be removed from Southpoint to prevent severe socioeconomic impact. Sincerely,
Alan Sutton PO Box 1025 Ocracoke, NC 27960

Correspondence ID:	13889	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
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. 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 Carinne R Hickman						
Correspondence ID:	13890	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	MIDGETT, Kristen						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. My husband and I are both full time, lifelong residents of Hatteras Island. We were married in October of 2009, purchased a plot of land in Buxton, and are building a new house. We are expecting our first child in August, a boy. I am employed full-time by Cape Hatteras Electric Comany and my husband is employed full-time by Midgett Realty. He is a third generation member of their family business. We have a vested interest in protecting the future of Hatteras Island as a whole; our property, our friends?.the people who live here, access to the seashore and the beaches, the natural surroundings, wildlife, sea life, and all that makes this island special. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS we must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. We 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. We believe that a reasonable and realistic approach into the management of CHNSRA will allow adequate protection of wildlife while maintaining a balance and necessary access to our beaches and seashore. As residents we are hosts of this beautiful island and welcome visitors. It has been our belief and experience that together we all share an interest and an obligation in preserving and protecting access to this land and the seashore for our families now. In turn, generations to come will be able to enjoy all that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area has to offer, both now and in the future. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area (CHNSRA). Thank you for your consideration of this very important issue. Respectfully, Kristen Midgett						
Correspondence ID:	13891	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Sutton, Melinda						
Received:	May.05,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Letter						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray: Ocracoke village, located on a small island in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, is completely dependent on tourism for its survival. The National Park Service DEIS plan recently released for public comment has used visitor demographics for Fort Raleigh and Wright Brothers Memorial in the interest of time since the economic study for Cape Hatteras Seashore is still under way. This does not take into account the true visitor demographics within the Cape Hatteras area. For example, those that vacation at Oregon Inlet are very different from those that vacation at Ocracoke. The economic study of Cape Hatteras National Seashore must be reviewed and used before the final ORV plan is released. Otherwise, this plan has the ability to cause severe adverse impacts to our local commercial and/or recreational tourist fishing industry. The Ocracoke community is concerned that the local lodging, restaurants, services, and cultural industries will be adversely affected by this plan's strict access to the seashore. Much of our local population's heritage includes commercial, as well as recreational fishing, in the Atlantic Ocean and Pamlico Sound. Most of our tourists, who support the local businesses, come to the island for the ability to access these areas. With the large buffers still listed in alternative F, access to the seashore will be severely restricted. The Board of Ocracoke Civic and Business Association supports the buffer distances and access alternatives listed in the Coalition for Beach Access DEIS statement recommendations for the current DEIS plan on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Until there is a willingness to work with our local community, whose livelihood depends on the environment, we will oppose the restrictions imposed by alternative F of the current DEIS plan. Sincerely, Melinda Sutton Secretary Ocracoke Civic and Business Association						
Correspondence ID:	13892	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 13:56:02						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I have spent many a wonderful day hiking through the outer banks of North Carolina. I especially enjoy Cape Hatteras and the preserved natural seashore. It is so wonderful to experience nature without honking cars, garishly colored beach houses blocking the view and noisy 4 wheelers. I would ask that they be severely imited on the cape and in fact, only used for those actually handicapped with no other means of accessing the area. Those who are able bodied do not need 4 wheelers to run up and down on! I have land myself, and it is a ongoing battle with 4 wheelers who do not stay on the dirt road (our fields of hay are much more fun to destroy), litter and leave gates open for our horse to wander through (I have invested in padlocks to solve that one). The majority of the 4 wheeling community I have had contact with believe they have a priviledge to ride where they please with no regard for others; basically large spoiled brats! I ask that we keep them off the beaches for safety and the pleasure of the rest of us who spend our vacation dollars in NC. Thank you, Anne Crews						
Correspondence ID:	13893	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y

Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:57:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV.
 Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.
 In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.
 Sincerely,
 Sharon K. Collins

Correspondence ID: 13894 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 13:58:12
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Murray, There is no reason why the National Park Service has to close down our beaches to protect birds and turtles. I disagree with your thinking. Hatteras Village does not need another set back. Hurricane Isabel did plenty of damage to our island in 2003. Now the Park Service, under the direction of special interest groups, is trying to destroy what is left of our island. We are good hard working Americans. We love our land, our neighbors and all of God's creatures. We do not need the NPS to shut down miles of beaches to protect a bird or turtle. We have been caring for these creatures for a long time. Birds migrate and pass through and visit our beaches on the way north or south. They have been doing this forever, and will continue to do this. I honestly feel you are doing more harm than good. There has been no significant increase in the population of these creatures, but the population of our island is diminishing because many are forced to leave because their means of living as been taken from them when you close the beaches. If left to their own devices, Hatteras would survive and be a better place than trying to survive under the terms and conditions you have set forth. Please reconsider your actions. Whose life is more important, a humans or a birds? Thank you for your time.

Correspondence ID: 13895 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: MIDGETT, THOMAS A
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray,
 Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. My wife and I are both full time, lifelong residents of Hatteras Island. We were married in October of 2009, purchased a plot of land in Buxton, and are building a new house. We are expecting our first child in August, a boy. My wife is employed full-time by Cape Hatteras Electric Comany and I am employed full-time by Midgett Realty. I am a college graduate who returned to the Island to join the third generation working in our family business. We have a vested interest in protecting the future of Hatteras Island as a whole; our property, our friends?.the people who live here, access to the seashore and the beaches, the natural surroundings, wildlife, sea life, and all that makes this island special.
 After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS we must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. We 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. We believe that a reasonable and realistic approach into the management of CHNSRA will allow adequate protection of wildlife while maintaining a balance and necessary access to our beaches and seashore. As residents we are hosts of this beautiful island and welcome visitors. It has been our belief and experience that together we all share an interest and an obligation in preserving and protecting access to this land and the seashore for our families now. In turn, generations to come will be able to enjoy all that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area has to offer, both now and in the future.
 Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area (CHNSRA).
 Thank you for your consideration of this very important issue.
 Respectfully,
 Thomas A. Midgett

Correspondence ID: 13896 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
 May 11, 2010
 Dear Superintendent Murray,
 Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
 I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
 Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
 Annette Daly 2323 Palisades Drive Appleton, WI 54915

Correspondence ID: 13897 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Blakney, Harold
Received: May,11,2010 14:00:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the scope used in the NPS ROI when evaluating the overall socioeconomic impacts proposed under the alternatives. (P270?) The ROI includes areas that would not be impacted by the proposed alternatives. The access closures proposed do not even appear in the ROI evaluated which would grossly skew the numbers towards ones that would have little effect. The ROI should be directly related to the area that the limits proposed would be imposed upon. Including the large population of non-affected areas attenuates the impact to the villages that would be directly and most impacted by the proposals. It is in these smaller villages (vs. the larger community of the Northern beaches) that the brunt of the economic impact will be felt by

those small businesses that are the majority of the providers in these smaller areas. It is these small businesses that local residents, visitors and tourists come to look forward to for their cultural "Island" experience. It is also these smaller businesses that make up the bulk of the landscape of these smaller villages. It is these cultural landmarks that would be affected the most and directly. The inclusion of such a board area that is not in scope is a flaw in the analysis done.

Correspondence ID: 13898 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Haskett, Mullen C
Received: May,11,2010 14:01:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I grew up in Cape Hatteras and lived there for 15 years. Hatteras is special in that vehicles are allowed to drive on the beaches and enjoy the beaches. The entire economy depends on tourists and will suffer severely if vehicles are not allowed on the beaches. If they are not able to drive on the beach, then a significant number of tourists will go somewhere else. I know that I will not drive another 1.5 hours when I can get the same thing somewhere else. Hatteras will be just another over-regulated beach like everywhere else. In this economy it makes absolutely no sense to close entire beaches and kill an economy. There has always been certain areas restricted during nesting season, but not the entire beach. There has to be some compromise.

Correspondence ID: 13899 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lalonde, Connie
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Date: May 10, 2010 To: National Park Service From: Subject: DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Comments My comments concern the DEIS of the Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan prepared by the National Park Service (NPS) for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. 1) Page 201: I disagree with the NPS statement: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs. ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve. Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations. It seems to me that any transgressions into protected area are the result of lack of NPS manpower and enforcement than the public purposely and willfully violating out of bounds areas. 2) Page xxiv: I question the statement of as per the DEIS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" If you close off huge sections of the beach, you force more people into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience. 3) Page xix and page 23: I am against having two different closures rules pertaining to the North facing beaches (North side) and the South facing beaches (South side) as per the grid outlined in Alternative "F". I disagree with the NPS proposal to close the beaches in villages of Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period for the Northern beaches, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages. Please, make them the same: May 15 -> September 15. 4) Page 1: I agree with your statement "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the seashore, and continue to be the most practical means of access and parking for many visitors." However, pedestrian only areas discriminate against individuals with limited mobility due to age or physical impairments, families with small children, and those wishing to engage in activities requiring recreational equipment (boogie boards, beach umbrellas, beach chairs, coolers, fishing rods and tackle, etc) 5) Page 53: I disagree with the special use permit proposed guidelines. It is impractical to allow the transportation of disabled visitors to the village beaches and then require the vehicle to be returned to the street or parking area. This necessitates the disabled person to have a driver to drop him (or her) off, then drive to a parking area, then trudge a long distance to the site of the drop off, then trudge the long distance through the sand back to get the vehicle. Suppose the handicap person wants to go to the beach, is capable of driving himself, yet cannot find another person to go with him? Does he now not go to the beach? This rule creates unnecessary hardships and risks in the event of an emergency as well. 6) Page 121 ? 127. I strongly disagree with the buffers as presented. We must allow for pass-thru corridors. The beach is linear with the ocean buffering on one side and the dune line on the other. For example - If you pinch off access on one side of a 4 mile linear beach and pinch off access on the other side of the 4 mile section of beach with no corridor, then you effectively have closed off all 4 miles of the beach because you CAN'T get there. The proposed bird buffers are too large, blocking access to the interior sections from the two "buffered" ends. I propose ORV pass-thru only corridors and to use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. I believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded. The 1,000 meter distance for the piping plover is way too large and not based upon peer reviewed science. A more rational distance would be 200 meters per other sites in the nation for the piping plover. Ample scientific evidence and precedent exists to support a 200 meter buffer. Buffers for other species, including American Oystercatchers, Least Terns and Colonial Waterbirds must also be changed. An effective 30 meter buffer should be established for these species rather than the 300 meter closure outlined in the DEIS. NON-ENDANGERED BIRDS should not have same protection as if endangered. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. 7) Page 468: I disagree with the limitations imposed on pedestrian and ORVs. Corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access. 8) Page 124: I strongly disagree with the NPS slant of providing for over protection of resource management over that of the public's right to access the beaches. Pro-active initiatives include: Vegetation Management, Habitat Management, Enhanced Predator Management, Colonial Water bird social attraction, Piping Plover check fledge rate, Piping plover chick buffer distance, and pass-through buffers during the incubation period. Opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of the above initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS. 9) I disagree with the NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies. These policies address the least significant factors affecting nest survival with little chance to have more than negligible impact. For example: the AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to non-human events. Using your own stats, the mammalian predation is 54%, Storm / Lunar Tides: 29%, Nest Abandonment: 6%, Avian Predation: 5%, and Ghost Crab Predation: 3%. So what is the percentage due to human interference: just 3%! It's insignificant, yet the NPS wants to ban humans when their actions provide very little influence on the success rate of breeding birds and turtles. 10) I disagree with the stats of breeding plovers and the other birds in the Park when the NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem, namely dredge and spoil island that are located just yards away and within sight of the seashore. These birds are part of the same ecosystem and should be included. Those spoil islands, developed by man from dredging the waterways in the Pamlico Sound for channel upkeep are slammed full of birds. The reason why so many birds? NO PREDATORS. SO, birds are not as stupid as one might think. You have to count these birds and incorporate them in the stats when the NPS is talking about any so called decline in breeding pairs in the National Park. 11) Page 1: I do not think the DEIS responsibly addresses the cultural resource issues. The very purpose of the DEIS as set forth in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources in the federal decision making process. In the DEIS, the statement "protect and preserve natural and cultural resources" appears in the first sentence of the first page of the plan, in the Purpose of the Plan section, and numerous times thereafter. Yet, the 810 page document devotes only two paragraphs to analysis of cultural resource issues. 12) Pages 270-281; 561-598: I strongly disagree with your economic analysis of the impact of the DEIS. The region of influence (ROI) incorporates the Northern Beach communities, including Kill Devil Hills, Kitty Hawk, Southern Shores and Duck. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore. ? Inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the 8 Seashore Villages ? Analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts. ? Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic interests within the greater ROI. On page xlvi. Alternative F is characterized as having a "negligible to moderate" adverse impact on small businesses. I strongly disagree with this statement. I believe the negligible to moderate projection is inaccurate and relies on economic surveys that has not yet been published. Furthermore, this material is not expected to be added to the

DEIS until after the public comment period has ended. Based upon the economic harm we have already experienced under the consent decree, Dare County projects the economic impact of Alternative F to be substantial. Beach closures have already had a devastating and unfair impact on many Dare County Businesses, causing foreclosures, bankruptcies, lay-offs, cutbacks, expensive refinancing, and depleted college funds and savings accounts. Pages 270-286, 561-598: The socio-economic data and analyses are incomplete and erroneous and result in an understatement of the effect the restrictions will have upon the Island, the region and the state of NC. The US Park Services answer: Businesses will have to "adapt" to the new rules. (p.383) The negative economic impacts of the decree ARE KNOWN, so to say that the added restrictions would have negligible to moderate impact is indefensible. 13) Overall Visitor Counts - Overall visitor counts appear to include visitors to Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial. A large percentage of these visitors vacation in the Northern Beaches communities and recreate on the non-federal beaches outside of the Seashore. Visitors who patronize the Fort Raleigh National Historic Site and the Wright Brothers National Memorial but do not visit the actual seashore areas need to be factored out. Maintenance of Future Access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke: All socioeconomic analyses related to Alternative F are predicated on the assumption that access corridors will remain open for at least an appreciable portion of the visitor high season. Under Alternative F, the access corridors will be subject to Resource Closures based on buffers similar or identical to the Consent Decree. Unless some predictability of access to Cape Point and South Point Ocracoke can be assured, economic analyses predicated on assumption of access are fundamentally flawed. Why would a group of surf fishermen want to come to Hatteras Island to surf fish if they are not sure they can access the prime fishing grounds at Cape Point? The answer is they won't come. If they don't come, they don't rent vacation homes and spend their money on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The definition of the Region of Influence (ROI), faulty data on economic activity generated by specific type recreational activity, incomplete visitation/business survey data, inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use, and flawed key assumptions concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative F, all lead to inaccurate conclusions in the socioeconomic analyses. Specifically, these inaccuracies can be seen as understating the negative socio-economic impact of the Seashore Villages. Further, this negative impact will be absorbed almost entirely by Small Businesses. Neither of these important aspects of the management alternatives are adequately presented in the DEIS. 14) Page 136: I strongly disagree with your pet restriction proposals. The "prohibition of pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages." = No Pets in public areas beaches, campgrounds, soundfront, foot trails, park maintained roads -from March 15 ?July 31. 15) Pages 125; 392 ? 396: SEA TURTLES. I disagree with the stats and procedures proposed. I think endangered sea turtles would benefit from management practices now in use at other federal seashores that are more proactive in efforts to achieve nesting success. This includes relocating nests to more desirable locations as is done in other state and federally controlled areas. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is on the northernmost fringe of turtle nesting locations for the southeast, accounting for about 1% of all turtle nests. Proposed buffer areas are not needed for protection of the turtles and amount to overprotection. 16) Pages 97- 101. I strongly disagree with proposals in this section saying that ORVs will be prohibited year round between ramps 27 and 30, at Hatteras Inlet (Hatteras Spit), Ocracoke Inlet (North Ocracoke Spit) and various other locations. Not allowing ORV access is paramount to denying the public access to these beaches. They are located miles from the nearest parking or paved road area and too far to access on foot. As a matter of course, there has been no breeding of piping plover or other endangered species at the Hatteras Island Inlet (spit) area in the past 6 years 17) Page 104: I disagree with the proposed night time driving closures. Per your proposals, night driving will be prohibited between May 1 and November 15th, forcing visitors off of the beaches early in the evening and preventing sunrise surf fishermen access in the morning. I propose a more moderate night time ban if one is needed, perhaps from June 1 ?September 15 with times being 1 hour after sunset and 1 hour before sunrise to allow beach goers to gather their stuff and exit the beach area. Certainly more proactive measures such as relocating nests prone to weather and ocean events would dramatically increase the nesting success rates. 18) Page 121: I disagree with the proposed beach closings, including pedestrian access from March 15 until July 31 in 8 different beach locations which have traditionally been available. Please leave these areas open to beach walkers, shell collectors and those that want to access the beaches in these areas. Conclusion: Please, incorporate access corridors through any SMA so we can get to the open beach beyond. Incorporate the birds into the count that nest on the spoil islands. Base your buffer zones on peer reviewed science and scale them back to more reasonable distances as discussed. It is neither logical nor reasonable to spend so much time, money and energy to overprotect a bird (Piping Plover) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore that is on the southernmost fringe area of its breeding ground. That goes for the loggerhead turtle that is in its northernmost breeding area. Let's scale back the buffer zones. You can always increase at a later date. The USPS is leaning way over the line on over protection and not enough on the public's right to enjoy the beaches of the National Seashore. The proper balance is not achieved in the propose DEIS and needs to be modified so that the proper balance of reasonable resource protection and access to the beaches of the National Park is achieved. I could sum it up by saying "Protect, not Prohibit." Thank you,
Connie Lalonde Vacation Home Owner

Correspondence ID:	13900	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept my following comments on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have previously reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Richard LaBranche Rehoboth, MA 02769						
Correspondence ID:	13901	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	N/A, N/A						
Received:	May,11,2010 14:04:58						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please extend the DEIS comment period. I need additional time to review it.						
Correspondence ID:	13902	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Comer, Sean C						
Received:	May,11,2010 14:06:49						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I have read the Cape Hatteras ORV DEIS and as an active visitor, taxpayer, and user of Cape Hatteras National Seashore I strongly recommend Alternative "A". This alternative manages ORV use and protects/preserves the environment, as has been done for the last 13 years. It also costs less than the other alternatives.						
Correspondence ID:	13903	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Kovalesky Jr. , Chester E						
Received:	May,11,2010 14:07:14						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please accept the following as my comments on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. The DEIS management alternatives has little to do with developing a responsible off road vehicle management plan and more with further intrusion on visitor freedoms within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area as requested by animal rights and environmental groups.						

As a visitor of the recreational area for over 10 years and an ORV operator on its beaches, I am saddened that there are those that feel citizens are not responsible enough to balance both recreational enjoyment with environmental stewardship. Most who enjoy the area do so with intentions of return visits on a yearly basis which have become family traditions. During these visits individuals not only enjoy being on the beach and fishing but also the beauty of the island and its wildlife that others feel ORV operators have no interest in. Many visitors belong to fishing groups which donate untold amounts of money towards keeping fish stocks at acceptable levels. Many belong to surfing groups that donate untold amounts of money towards keeping beaches clean and ocean waters clean. Many visitors belong to groups such as Ducks Unlimited who donate untold amounts of money to keep wetlands clean and available for waterfowl and other inhabitants. The list can go on. This issue comes down to either a political issue to which involved parties in the decision process feel they cannot act against the pressure of the lobbying party or the highlighting of data which makes up a very small percentage of visitors to the park that don't adhere to the rules by which all others conduct themselves. Please don't let the actions of a few dictate the direction for the majority. Do those actions sometimes cause harm to animals and environment? Unfortunately they do, but hurricanes and high tides can have the same detrimental effect on bird and turtle nesting areas within the beaches of Cape Hatteras. Give the local community and the traditional visitors the power to assist the Park Service with enforcement and the education of the frailty of the park's ecosystem along with the role and responsibility of everyone visiting Cape Hatteras to keep the Cape clean and safe for everyone and everything. We just don't need exaggerated rules to make this happen. Please don't make Hatteras Island an extension of the existing Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge. The refuge's own objectives already provide what seem to be the end game in the DEIS management plan.

I have reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put actual people, not lawyers, back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

With great respect and great concern,
Chester E. Kovalesky Jr. Durham, NC

Correspondence ID: 13904 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:09:37
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV.
Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.
In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.
Sincerely,
Curtis Hetherington

Correspondence ID: 13905 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Mosher, Debora D
Received: May,11,2010 14:09:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This concerns the management of Cape Hatteras National Park with the draft plan of the ORV management. I believe that the plan is too restrictive to the people of the area, the people who own homes, and the visitors from all across the USA and foreign countries. When we were visiting the Park last summer, we were not allowed to walk to "the point" near the water's edge which is more that 1,000 meters from the nesting birds. Your restrictions seem to go way beyond the interest of preservation of the wildlife of birds and turtles. I believe that the plan that has been selected should be revised to allow more human contact on the beaches.
Buffers are very important to the nesting birds, but what are the limits to these buffered areas? In our locality we have nesting bald eagles that tolerate human closeness - we can observe and appreciate the entire cycle of raising young chick within 100 yards. No one wants to disturb them and they do not. I do not see any scientific literature that supports your buffered area/restricted areas of the local nesting birds. In fact, if the local people and visitors were invested in helping with the long-term restoration of the animals, there would be a great outpouring of support.
At the present, due to the removal of people from the beach during the summertime, many predators such as raccoons and rats are hungry (the fish entrails are removed); therefore, they feed on the small birds and chicks. The new regulations have completely upset the wildlife cycle as it has stood for many years. There is an overabundance of these predators due to the new guidelines. It is a fact that most nesting birds would be quite successful on islands in the sound without human or predator interference. Can this be accomplished?
The National Parks were made for recreation for the citizens of America. Somehow the citizens have been left out of the formula with the new plan. Human life on the outer banks has had a history for over 300 years which should be taken into account when preparing a future for years to come. These people can not be cut out with any regard, but instead, they should be listened to and respect their opinions which are valuable.
As you read this comment you can understand that I do not like the present plan and hope that agreement can be reached that balances all the parties involved. At the present the citizens of the area have been regulated to a position that severely impacts their life to a very negative degree.
Thank you for the freedom to write my opinion. I hope that the future will be bright and successful of all concern: people, birds, turtles, wildlife and the sand and ocean.

Correspondence ID: 13906 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:10:30
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As an avid angler on the North Carolina seashore, I am strongly opposed to the National Park Service (NPS) preferred alternative, Alternative F, in the DEIS and urge you to make significant changes to the preferred alternative in order to provide both reasonable resource protection and reasonable public access to public land. Recreational fishing is one of the most enjoyable American pastimes, and Cape Hatteras National Seashore has some of the best surf fishing locations on the east coast ? accessible only by ORV.
Alternative F is the most restrictive management option to date, far exceeding any sense of balance between resource protection and public access and betraying all promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore. The majority of the provisions included within the preferred alternative far exceed anything proposed by a majority of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee, including excessively large resource closures (buffers), unnecessary year-round and floating closures, and the lack of access corridors around or through resource closures.
In order to restore balance to the DEIS, I highly recommend that the NPS revisit the proposal put forth to the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee in December of 2009. It provides the necessary protections for wildlife resources while having the support of a majority of the local community. Without reasonable ORV access, responsible anglers like me, and the local economy that is supported by recreational fishing, suffer greatly. I urge you

to provide a better balance between resource protection and recreational uses by incorporating the December 2009 recommendations from the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee into the preferred alternative.

Sincerely,
Katie Hetherington

Correspondence ID:	13907	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 14:11:21						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	As a tax payer, I am most disturbed at being denied beach access in my vehicle. My invalid mother loves the beach and is not mobile enough to walk over the dunes. We visit the Cape Hatteras area twice a year and spend money on fishing licenses, restaurants, cottage rental, shopping. If we are denied vehicle beach access, we will not return to this beautiful area. Pea Island wildlife preserve offers protected areas for plovers, etc. I can't believe that a compromise can not be worked out. The residents of this island should not lose their way of life nor they means for making a living. When you close the beaches, you will lose tourists.						
Correspondence ID:	13908	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 14:12:20						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	To our Government; I disagree with some of what you are doing .I love nature and wildlife But I love this place to be able to walk anywhere on the beach and see things that come up on shore is a blessing.I believe God would rather see his people using the beach .Than to save it for the birds and animals alone. There are places on the beach where people do not walk or fish.This community is a second home for us .We know the people who come to Fairhaven Church that live down here and they need the beaches open for thier lively hood . We are here for 4 months out of the year .Camp at Ocean Waves campground .2 months in the spring and 2 in the fall. All the food we buy at stores and eating out 3 to4 times a week. The resturants will go out of buisness if this happens and home owner will loose the rental homes and ALL the bait shops will go out buisness also. There are so many of us here who drive on the beach to fish because of health reasons.We are older people who come down in the spring and have to have help ,here is this campground we have people who have walkers and canes.There is no way I can fish on the beach if I can't get there. If we can not go on the beaches how are the bird watchers going to see these birds?I know they need to be saved BUT there has to be another way . PLEASE HELP AND SAVE OUR BEACHES FOR THE PEOPLE AND NOW JUST ANIMALS AND BIRDS. Thank you so very much for trying to find a way to help us all. Jo & Garry Moorefield.						
Correspondence ID:	13909	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Rucker, Allison L						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Allison Rucker Kill Devil Hills, NC						
Correspondence ID:	13910	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Peavler, Wayne L						
Received:	May,11,2010 14:14:07						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Why allow these red necks to continue to tear up things. They can buy property and ruin it,not public property.						
Correspondence ID:	13911	Project:	10641	Document:	32596		
Name:	Osborne, Terri						
Received:	May,11,2010 14:14:21						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Our family has been going to Ocracoke Island for 30 years. We swim, walk, collect shells, fly kites, fish, and generally enjoy the "wildness of mother nature". It is where we go to recharge and relax and forget about the stresses of our daily lives. We are there 1 or 2 weeks per year and pump \$2,000-\$3000 per year into the local economy from house rental, dining out nightly and making local purchases. We are in support of returning to the Interim Plan which managed the Seashore just fine for decades. However, since that is unlikely to happen, I would like to present our rebuttal to the DEIS plan, specifically Alternative F. Anyone with an understanding of Cape Hatteras knows that the best fishing, swimming, and shelling spots can be miles from the nearest asphalt. People use street-legal, licensed vehicles to access those areas. No four-wheelers are allowed. The speed limit on the beach is 25 MPH and most people drive slower. All state laws are in effect as are additional federal laws. Compared to other areas the beaches of Hatteras Island are virtually free of litter. As outlined on pages xii, xvii, and 468 of the DEIS, corridors would only be permitted in Management Level 2 portions (ML2) of Species Management Areas (SMA). In more restrictive Management Level 1 portions (ML1) corridors would not be permitted at all. We disagree with this position. Corridors are vital to providing access in a way that does not hinder resource protection. Corridors provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to OPEN areas that would otherwise be blocked. Also, the closures prevent pedestrians from walking on the beach, not just people driving trucks. In some instances, corridors can be made through or around closure areas. In other places corridors can be established below the high tide line. Since unfledged chicks are not found in nests between the ocean and the high tide line, this type of pass through corridor would have no negative effect on wildlife and should be established throughout the seashore. Therefore, we believe pass through corridors should be maintained for pedestrians and ORVs in all areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area throughout the entire breeding and nesting season. Numerous shorebirds in Cape Hatteras National Seashore are given higher levels of protection in a proposed off-road vehicle management plan than what the law ever intended the birds to have. The piping plover is the only seashore bird species protected under the Endangered Species Act. It is threatened but, not endangered. Other birds covered by the NPS are not even threatened, for instance the American Oystercatcher. The NPS also needs to count birds on the dredge islands. Why are these birds not included already in counts? Buffers: DEIS pages 121-127 discuss protective buffers. We believe these are inappropriately large. For example, Piping Plover unfledged chicks, are given a protective buffer of minimum of 1,000 meters in all directions. the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000 meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. We believe a more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters which is the buffer used at other National Seashores. Since these birds are not found between the high tide line and the water, this is another reason to always permit corridors. Buffers for non-threatened species could be reduced from the 300 meter DEIS recommendation to 30 meters. As for Turtle closures, we have always believed the roping off that is done to protect the nests are adequate. The National Park Service should consider						

0012641

turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas. This would be the best method to protect the nests when hurricanes are approaching.

The DEIS plan would prohibit dogs from the seashore. Our family feels the current leash requirements for dogs are more than adequate. I can understand forbidding a dog in a life guarded section of beach which is extremely crowded but it makes no sense if a family has arrived at an area by ORV.

President Roosevelt had a vision for the seashore when Congress first designated the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area as America's first national seashore. Generations have enjoyed its uniqueness and beauty. We are all stewards of the wildlife there and the majority of us go under the guise of "leave nothing but footprints". Hatteras and Ocracoke Island have flourished through the years as tourism is the main economy there. The Consent Degree has devastated many businesses with revenue and jobs lost. We urge you to revise alternative F and save our seashore. North Carolina's Senators as well as Dare County have and various preservation groups have made valid comments and suggestions and our family would like the NPS and the Department of the Interior to listen to them.

Sincerely,

Terri and Dennis Osborne 2000 Carbon Hill Dr. Midlothian, VA 23113

Correspondence ID: 13912 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: & Karol, John
Received: May,11,2010 14:15:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We do not think that allowing off-road vehicles on the Cape Hatteras Nat'l Seashore is a good idea environmentally. The off-roaders will inevitably damage the fragile ecosystem on Cape Hatteras. We need to preserve this area for the wildlife that live there and for future generations to enjoy. The noise and pollution will be disruptive and destructive.

Correspondence ID: 13913 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:16:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: dear mr park service, i am a 55 year old man, fourth generation hatterasman. my wife and i retired here after hurricane isabel. i wasn't fortunate enough to live all my life here. i spent 29 years of my life running 2 businesses, but i came to hatteras just about every weekend and holiday for those 29 years. my grandfather was a successful poundnetter. he was interviewed twice by the national geographic and twice by duke university for being a man that had never left the island and had more knowledge and common sense than most men today. as a kid i sat on his front porch and listened to him tell me stories where the breach was in 2003 from hurricane isabel that there used to be a bridge there, and he told me that we would probably see that bridge again. well, we didn't see the bridge but we did see the old pilings from where the bridge used to be in my lifetime. as far as the beach and as far back as i can remember, weather permitting, after he ate dinner every evening, he left the house and walked the beach. he met many people and he saw and experienced all the wildlife, and he talked about birds and animals that came and went on hatteras island, and how alot of animals and birds were brought here by the rich northerners during the waterfowl haydays before limits. as we all know who study the wildlife of hatteras island, the majority of the birds, not just waterfowl, migrate in one form or another, and i have yet to meet a person who intentionally wants to kill or mane a turle or a piping plover, and therefore, just like in the past and just like i was taught, things will come and go on hatteras island. so be careful of what you are protecting. the park service can continue to push the people off hatteras island, like my grandfather predicted many years ago, and then you may have protected the piping plover and you may have protected a turtle, but while doing so you have ruined a way of life that goes back to the beginning of our country's history. at that point, you start destroying the united states government because from the beginning of our nation, we were put here to progress. So i would bank on the things my grandfather taught me about hatteras island the sounds and the ocean and you will never be able to put it back like it was. therefore, you should leave the people of hatteras island and their visitors alone and drop this ridiculous issue of chasing birds and turtles that sometime never exist up and down the seashores of our islands and outer banks. sit back and take a deep breath and take each village one by one and the impact of what you are doing to all those villages combined and equate that against some piping plovers that can fly away and go anywhere they want to go and a few turtles have the whole ocean and beaches to theirselves. so, this is my position on the over eight hundred pages that were written about hatteras island and how off road vehicle use should be controlled when in fact you may be putting your own selves out of a job. look what the government has allowed to happen to economies all over the country and each of every one of you reading this letter is not exempt. so be careful what you wish for. thank you. david ballance

Correspondence ID: 13914 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:17:06
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: My wife and I have been coming to Avon, NC for yearly vacations for the past eight years. Most recently over the past four years, we have been able to share the wonderful beach experience with our young sons. Closing off beach access will take away life long memories and experiences from not only our family, but friend's families and countless others that flock to the Outer Banks for recreation and vacation. In addition, it is readily apparent that a closed national sea shore would severely impact commerce, real estate investments, state revenue and those who's livelihoods depend on the tourist trade. I am an advocate of managing the environment and our natural resources, but this approach to totally cutting off access to a national treasure is not in the best interest of all involved. We need to find common ground and consensus between constituencies on both sides of the issue so that everyone can continue to enjoy this cherished destination while also being mindful of the preservation of the environment. Entirely closing off access is a totalitarian approach that ignores the voices and desires of countless people that support the Outer Banks, and is frankly un-american.
Eric Wong

Correspondence ID: 13915 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: CAROL HALL SUHR 9702 Locust Hill Drive 50090 Live Oak Lane 46215 Tower Circle S Great Falls VA 22066 Frisco NC 27936 Buxton NC 27920 703-759-0070 carol@suhr.com
May 11, 2010
Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo NC 27954 Sent via internet to
Dear Mr. Murray:
I am hereby commenting on the DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan draft dated March 2010.
1. Executive Summary, page i, paragraph 1: I disagree with the naming of the area. Please change it to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area as defined in Title 16, Chapter 1, subchapter LXIII, dated June 29, 1940.
2. Elsewhere in the document, where the area is referred to as "Cape Hatteras Seashore", please change it to "Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". (I will refer to it as Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area or CHNSRA from here on.)
3. Page 1. Purpose of the Plan. I disagree that the plan sufficiently addresses the charge to protect and preserve cultural resources. The glossary includes "cultural practices" as part of the definition of cultural resources.

Driving on the beach plays a large part in the culture practices of the local residents and visitors who have traditionally accessed the beaches via ORV for gatherings of families and friends and for surfing, picnicking, bathing, fishing and other beach activities. ORV access to a majority of the shoreline is an integral part of the island culture and should be considered more fully in the plan.

4. Page 1. Purpose of the Plan. I agree with the statement: "ORVs have long served as a primary form of access for many portions of the beach in the Seashore, and continue to be the most practical available means of access and parking for many visitors." However, designating pedestrian only or having different buffers for ORV and pedestrian access discriminate against individuals with limited mobility, families with small children, and those who use heavy or bulky recreational equipment (fishing equipment, surf boards, picnic equipment, kite boarding equipment, etc.). The enabling legislation established the area for the enjoyment and benefit of the people. Banning any class of people from access to the shoreline goes against the enabling legislation.

5. Page 1. Purpose of the Plan. I agree with the statements: "These habitats are also home to numerous other protected species, as well as other wildlife. The NPS is required to conserve and protect all of these species, as well as the other resources and values of the Seashore."

However, the plan does not allow for conservation and protection of all species. According to the 2009 Annual Piping Plover report, the NPS trapped and removed 464 animals including 25 red fox, 1 gray fox, 152 raccoons, 102 opossum and 105 opossum kits, 10 nutria, 3 coyote and 1 mink. The report did not detail what was done with these animals. Since other animals were taken to shelters or released, I assume these were killed. The plan does not address how these animals will be conserved and protected.

6. Page 2. I agree that the plan should provide protection for threatened, endangered, and other protected species. I disagree that North Carolina species of concern and non-endangered species should be given the same protection as endangered species.

7. Page 7. I disagree that the plan should be reviewed at five year intervals. It should be reviewed annually and as social, economic and environmental changes may occur. What would happen changes were made to the threatened and endangered species lists? What if the economic assumptions are incorrect and there is a large increase in unemployment, foreclosures, and bankruptcies? That has to be considered in the plan.

8. Page 8. I disagree with targets for piping plover. Statistics show that the number of mating pairs of piping plovers is closely associated with severe weather en route to and from their wintering grounds in the southern U. S., particularly Florida. Having a target that has not been met during the last 17 years is unrealistic, given the association with factors that are beyond the control of the NPS. Page 186 of the DEIS lists that there were 331 breeding pairs of piping plover in DE, MD, VA and NC in 2008. The 11 counted in the CHNSRA account for a tiny 3.32%.

9. Page 16. I disagree that ORV driving is a recreational activity. It is, as it has been historically, a means of getting from one place to another on the beach. It is a means of getting from the road to the shoreline. No one that I know drives on the beach just to drive on the beach.

10. Page 31. I agree that local businesses are concerned with limiting ORV access to the shorelines. It has been well-documented by local businesses that their income decreases significantly when closures are in effect. Please include rental home owners in the "small business category".

My husband and I own one oceanfront rental home in Buxton and one sound front rental home in Frisco. The 2010 oceanfront income is down by 7% and our sound front income is down by 18% from 2009. Oceanfront renters are less affected by ORV closures (especially ocean fronts in Buxton which have pedestrian access to prime fishing spots) than sound front renters who rely on ORVs to access the beach. People have written in our guest book and emailed me that they were very unhappy with the beach closures.

11. Pages 97 to 101. I strongly disagree with proposals that would prohibit ORVs year round at various places including but not limited to the area between ramps 27 and 30, Hatteras Inlet on Hatteras Island and Ocracoke Island, and Ocracoke Inlet.

These areas contain some of the best fishing and family fun beaches in the National Seashore Recreational Area and are primarily inaccessible by foot. They are key areas of "cultural practices" of family outings and fishing. Closing them year round is unnecessary for the protection of any threatened or endangered species. For example, the NPS 2009 Piping Plover Report, page 17, showed no piping plover observations at Hatteras Island Spit between August 2008 and March 2009, less than ten sightings in August 2008 at Cape Point and none over the next seven months, and zero to ten sightings per month at northeast Ocracoke Island. There have been no breeding piping plover or other endangered species at Hatteras Island Inlet spit in six years. There has been no evidence of killed piping plover chicks due to ORV usage. Keeping these areas accessible by ORV is necessary for the survival of the residents and home owners of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

12. Page 104. I disagree with the proposed night time driving restrictions. I agree there should be a ban on ORV night driving during turtle mating season and at times they are likely to be mating. Please limit the restrictions to mating season (more like June 1 to September 15) and when it is dark outside (more like after sunset to one hour before sunrise). Furthermore, I support the moving of turtle nests to areas that are not subject to wash over. This would serve two purposes: increased survival of the species and increased public access to the beaches.

13. Page 108, alternative D. I disagree that ORV parking should be limited to one deep. Driver discretion should be used as to not obstruct the flow of vehicles.

14. Page 108, Carrying Capacity. I disagree. There should be no carrying capacity restrictions. The cost of enforcing these would outweigh any environmental benefit. Do you propose that if the capacity is reached that there would be a waiting line to access the beach? Think about it? People would keep their ORV engines running sitting inside their ORVs with the air conditioning on, children would be climbing on the dunes, etc.

15. Page 110. I disagree with the proposed speed limit. I feel it should be 10 mph.

16. Page 113. I disagree with the proposed ban of pets in the CHNSRA during bird breeding season. I propose dogs be allowed on six-foot leashes at all times in all areas. Dogs on six-foot leashes pose no threat to any species of any kind.

17. Page 127: Closures and buffers. I disagree with the proposed buffers. I support ORV pass-through corridors in all areas of the National Seashore Recreational area, except in front of the village ocean front homes. When one section of beach is closed (for example, north of Billie Mitchell Field) and another is closed (for example, south of Cape Point), although a relatively small area is officially closed, the effect is closure of miles of beach. Pass-through corridors near the high tide line will have no impact on endangered or threatened species. The buffers for unfledged piping plover chicks should be moved as the chicks move. A buffer of 1,000 meters is uncalled for and could be as small as 200 meters, according to research. Buffers for other birds listed in the proposal should be reduced to 30 meters, which is an adequate distance, supported by research.

18. Page 130. Protect cultural resources? I disagree that plans C through F protect the cultural practices of the island people. As stated on page 1 of this letter, cultural practices are defined as being part of the "cultural resources". The plans put a much higher emphasis on birds and wildlife than human access to the beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. This is not a wilderness area. The 1938 charter that established the area did so for the enjoyment of the people for recreational purposes.

19. In general: ORV and pedestrian access to the shoreline is an insignificant factor in the survival of the piping plover on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands, as detailed in the NPS 2009 Piping Plover report. When the death rate due to tropical storms and late season hurricanes during PPL southern migration is factored in, ORV and pedestrian traffic in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is not even an issue.

20. In general: The NPS captures bird, turtle and amaranth statistics only in the park. They do not include bird counts in other locations such as the dredge and spoil islands that are breeding grounds for thousands and thousands of birds. In 2009 NPS counted six fledged chicks and between 1992 and 2009 counted an average of 4.9 per year. It is likely there are many more fledging on the remote dredge and spoil islands and on Pea Island because there are no predators (i.e., foxes, raccoons, etc.). When calculating survival of a species, one must consider the entire mating area. And, related to that statement, the eleven piping plover chicks that fledged in 2008 represented just 3.32% of those counted in Delaware, Maryland, Virginia and North Carolina.

21. Page 143: Visitor use experience impact. ORV users in the areas under management comprise the vast majority people visiting the ORV access area, since most of the areas are inaccessible except by ORV. Creating a plan that has the cumulative impact that is "long term moderate to major and adverse to ORV users" is unacceptable. The assumption that it would be long term beneficial for non-ORV users is irrelevant since they comprise a minute percent of the population in areas accessible by ORV only.

22. Page 270 to 281 and more. The towns north of the CHNSRA should not be included in the ROI for economic analysis. As stated, the villages of Ocracoke, Hatteras, Frisco, Buxton, Avon, Salvo, Waves, and Rodanthe would be most affected by the proposed actions because they are located within the Seashore. The economic impact of beach closures has not been adequately addressed. Please carefully read comments from local business owners about the impact to their businesses and those from Dare County and North Carolina officials. I urge the NPS to do complete, unbiased research on the real economic impact of their alternatives on the CHNSRA residents and home owners.

In addition to the impact on local businesses, please consider the adverse economic impact to rental house owners. This year's decrease of 18% on our sound front rental income is causing us severe harm. Our expenses remain about the same, regardless of our rental income. Just look at the number of

houses for sale and the number of foreclosures. ORV driving restrictions are hurting everyone.

Stating statistics for North Carolina or Dare County and making assumptions about the economy or demography of villages in the CHNSRA is erroneous.

23. Page 562. Economic impact. To estimate that the economic impact of plan F on income to sporting goods businesses and to other businesses in the "Seashore villages" would be 0% to -10% must be based on flawed research. Please conduct a complete survey of businesses in the villages and include their revenues for July of each year. That would allow you to calculate the impact of the recent closures. The 0% to -10% figure doesn't meet the first test of valid research which is, "Does it make sense?" The research done by RTI was not completely reported in the DEIS. Reference was made to "Even businesses that reported no decrease or an increase in revenue in 2008 under the consent decree were concerned about the long-term impacts of the alternatives, even alternatives similar to the consent decree." But no where did the DEIS quote statistics from those businesses that said income was down.

24. Page 570. No where is there mention of the economic impact on non-resident rental home owners. These people, including my husband and myself, should be considered as "small business owners", too.

25. Page 570. I am happy to see that additional data are being collected. I have not heard about the publication of the 12-month study which was expected to be completed in early 2010. I urge you to re-open the comment time after the new research has been published.

Sincerely,
Carol Hall Suhr

Correspondence ID: 13916 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:18:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Park 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 May 11, 2010
 Re: Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Draft Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/EIS
 Dear Mr. Murray:
 This letter is a comment made under your draft EIS as referred to above.
 Your failure to make reasonable allowance for human use of specialized areas in the Park is a bad way to allocate the use of the Park and, I believe, is illegal under your organic act.
 Your EIS seems to take the position that in any action you must give primacy to what might be good for birds (NB, only the plover is endangered and has any special protection at a high level). You would find that your actions would be less objectionable to many, would be closer to reasonable and would bring less disrepute upon the Park Service, if you were to make some compromises and balance the rights of birds and the rights of people. For example, kite boarders, in the ocean, really only need a limited amount of beach space (and parking) to launch down wind sessions, and kites, surfers and windsurfers, as well as fisherman, all see Cape Point as a special spot (and one it is hard to believe is optimal for birds given it frequent flooding and high winds). If you were to preserve these kinds spaces (including, in addition, Ego Beach, the Lighthouse Beach, Lifeguard Beach, the existing ramp areas, etc.) for human usage, you could still maintain large areas for birds and other animals you wish to protect.
 The enabling legislation (which governs you) for the Park makes sit clear that this is the law. In fact the language goes even further and says you must give precedence to these areas for personal use. As your EIS states:
 As stated in the Seashore's enabling legislation (the Act), Congress established the Seashore in 1937 as a national seashore for the enjoyment and benefit of the people, and to preserve the area. The Act states:
 Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses, particularly swimming, boating, sailing, fishing, and other recreational activities of similar nature, which shall be developed for such uses as needed [emphasis added], the said areas shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness and no development of the project or plan for the convenience of visitors shall be undertaken which would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora and fauna or the physiographic conditions now prevailing in this area. (NB, none of the plovers is other animals you seek to protect are unique to the area!)
 This right of people to certain uses of the Park is not permissive; it is mandatory under your governing Statute. I do not believe you have any right to contravene the law, as I believe your EIS does in failing to take into account these specialized areas.
 Sincerely yours,
 rick eustis Avon, NC

Correspondence ID: 13917 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:18:48
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To All, I disagree with the approach taken concerning beach use of the Park Service. I THINK VISITORS TO THE PARK SHOULD HAVE CLEARLY DEFINED AREA'S WITH YEAR AROUND ABILITY TO ENJOY THE SEASHORE. THIS WOULD INCLUDE FISHING AND HIKING... The Proposals presented will cause major harm to the economy and not allow people to enjoy nature ... Stanley Oliver

Correspondence ID: 13918 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Smith, Robert K
Received: May,11,2010 14:18:58
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am taking this opportunity to comment on the ORV DEIS plans. I have read, and discussed at length, the NPS DEIS. I see all of the options listed as nothing more than a thin attempt to rob me and future generations of access to this beautiful unspoiled place. It sickens me that visiting, fishing, and relaxing with friends and loved ones will soon be a thing of the past. I do not for an instant believe that this abomination to Ted Roosevelt's legacy has anything to do with saving birds or turtles
 North Carolina is on the fringe of the piping plovers nesting range, and in all of my years of visiting the Outer Banks, have never seen anyone run one over, or harm one for that matter. A six thousand foot circle around a 4 ounce bird is ridiculous on its face. To do such an extreme thing for a bird that is only locally "threatened", at the expense of the livelihood of so many of my friends is an immoral crime.
 I have already visited Buxton three times this year. I love the place and will be deeply hurt when I can no longer visit, or take children there to see it for the first time. My niece's idea of a beautiful beach was Myrtle Beach until she saw Avon. I am literally being robbed so some stinking lawyer can line his pockets with my tax money. I witnessed first hand, the animosity of the island locals to Park Service employees.
 I know I am wasting my breath, and that this deal is done (and was done behind closed doors long before now), but for the record, I would prefer the adoption of the Coalition for Beach Access Statement in lieu of any of the Draft EIS plans.
 It is, and should remain, the Cape Hatteras National RECREATIONAL Seashore. That is what was promised to its previous owners. The choice is yours, will future children look upon Park Service employees the way I did as a child, or as police state guards that patrol no trespassing zones?

Correspondence ID: 13919 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Rucker, George K
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
 Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.

I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13920 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Midgett, Trisha M
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13921 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:22:24
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: 13922 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:22:24
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 recent oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico highlights what a fragile ecosystem our coastlines are. We must give seabirds and other wildlife a chance to live and raise their young in their natural habitat--the seashore.
The following principles should underpin the park's formulation of its final plan, should it not choose to enact Alternative D:
*Provide Equal Access for All Visitors. Under the National Park Service's preferred plan, Alternative F, ORVs would be prohibited year round on only 16 of the 68 total miles of Seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed within the park, at least half of the beach should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Combined with more walkways and better access facilities, this approach would provide balanced access for all visitors. Pedestrians and families could then more safely enjoy the Seashore, and wildlife could have a chance to rebound to its traditional numbers and diversity within the park.
* Put Natural Resources First. Protection of the natural resources and wildlife of the Seashore should come first, and recreational use should be consistent with this protection. The preferred plan fails to set aside adequate areas that are free of ORV use year round for wildlife including breeding, migrating, and wintering species. Wildlife protection must be based on the best scientific information. Wildlife disturbance buffers in the preferred plan are minimums and should be increased if necessary to protect breeding birds and sea turtles.
* Establish and Meet Clear Goals for Wildlife Recovery. A plan must include clear goals and milestones for wildlife recovery. Where there are management targets in the DEIS, they need more thorough vetting based on the potential of the Seashore to support wildlife rather than on its recent degraded abilities. Where birds, turtles, and plants are not coming back as planned, based on annual reviews, additional protective measures should be implemented until recovery goals are met. These goals, and adequate management to realize them, should be for migrating and wintering species as well as breeding ones.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I will be following the progress of your efforts at Cape Hatteras and look forward to a more balanced final plan for all visitors that better protects the natural resources of the Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13923 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:22:55
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the NPS policy of closing access corridors for bird or turtle nesting activity. There are other effective ways of protecting the birds and turtles which allow access for people. NPS could relocate turtle nests if they should be found in a corridor. Nests are routinely relocated when threatened by the weather, why not when found in an area reserved for people access? Pedestrian and ORV bypasses should be provided around bird buffers so that access can be maintained.

Correspondence ID: 13924 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:24:29
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: What is the matter with you people? Do you think more of birds, etc than you do people? Those that come to the Outer Banks of NC from cities cannot believe their eyes as to the beauty of the ocean as far as their eyss can see.
I only live about 200 miles inland and I can tell you it takes my breath away to be able to sit on the beach and just stare at the ocean. I ask myself how can all that water stay where it is. I know that it is the hand of God.
Please do not make all of the Outer Banks of NC a refuge for wildlife. After all, God takes care of the birds, etc. Let the public bring in the revenue to the businesses. If you close all the land then Dare county will dry up.

Correspondence ID: 13925 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:27:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mr. Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
May 11, 2010
Dear Supt. Murray,
Thank you very much for seeking comments on the ORV Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
My extended family has been enjoying the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area (CHNSRA) since the late 1960's, primarily camping at Salvo and Oregon Inlet (the early days) and then Cape Point (before the maintenance and drainage issues became such a problem there) until 2003, and now the Ocracoke NPS campgrounds. We return almost every year, and will again this June. It remains a very special place for our family.
I have communicated with you and Cindy Holda several times previously, providing comments on the situation at the Cape Point Campground, the management of wildlife within the CHNSRA, and the access for ORVs at the CHNSRA. You may perhaps remember me - the guy from Indiana with a Masters Degree in Environmental Engineering working for Engineering Consulting firms since the mid 1980's ? doing my best to protect and clean-up the small portion of this precious Mother Earth that I come in contact with on a daily basis.
I commend you and your staff on your continued efforts to balance the needs of preservation with those of responsible use. Unfortunately, the current Consent Decree requirements, and the majority of the Alternatives cited in the DEIS, do not achieve a healthy balance between responsible use and preservation ? the scale is weighted far too heavily on protecting avian species that are not endangered, requires an exceedingly excessive exclusion zone for piping plovers, and does not allow for the relocation of turtle nests in appropriate circumstances - I heartily object to all of those provisions of the DEIS and the Consent Decree. The Consent Decree measures also unnecessarily restrict ORV access by not allowing alternative access routes where appropriate. It is indeed unfortunate that the Negotiated Rule-Making Process was unable to successfully reach an acceptable compromise during their deliberations - I initially had high hopes for that process.
I have reviewed the lengthy DEIS, and based on this review provide the following comments:
1. I strongly support the Pro-Active Adaptive Management (PAAM) alternative, as this alternative provides the best balance between appropriate protection of resources, while providing for responsible use of CHNSRA by pedestrians and ORV's. Although perhaps requiring more attention by Park Service personnel to the dynamics of park use by both wildlife and human visitors, the PAAM should be used to improve both the resource protection and the visitor access to the Seashore, by aggressively pursuing the adaptive management initiatives identified in the DEIS: vegetation management, habitat management, enhanced predator management, colonial waterbird social attraction, piping plover chick fledge rate, piping plover chick buffer distance and pass-through buffers for ORVs during the incubation period. In addition, opportunities to implement less restrictive closures as a result of these initiatives should be considered more frequently than the 5-year periodic review process identified in the DEIS.
2. The data presented in your "Cape Hatteras National Seashore Resource Management Field Studies" reports for the past several years (which I review religiously), as well as other historical data presented in the peer-reviewed technical literature, clearly demonstrate that Human Interference (and use of ORV's) has a very minor impact on avian species nest survival and fledging rates (accounting for approx 3% of nest failures) , when compared to natural predators (approx 62%), storms and tides (approx 29%), and nest abandonment (approx 6%). Therefore, any ORV closures required for protection of avian species should be guided by the science of PAAM and the more universally practiced procedures at other National Seashores, and not an arbitrarily imposed buffer of 1000meters.
3. I have personally observed the successful nesting/fledging of avian species on the dredge and spoil islands located soundside of the CHNSRA. In addition, the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge provides additional appropriate habitat for the successful nesting/fledging. Avian activity in these areas should be included in the data evaluated when looking for trends in avian species nesting/fledging.
Thank you very much for your continued efforts on behalf of the citizens who enjoy and use the amazing resources of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. Kindly consider my comments as the rule-making process proceeds. Best wishes for a resolution that balances the preservation and appropriate use of this precious spot.
Sincerely,
Kenneth Hill 5504 Leisure Dr Valparaiso, IN 46383

Correspondence ID: 13926 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Earrame, Jason
Received: May,11,2010 14:28:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Motorized vehicles should never be on beaches. Keep our beaches pristine!

Correspondence ID: 13927 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Jones, Brian K
Received: May,11,2010 14:29:59
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The beaches should be available for the public, but I agree with managing where vehicles should be allowed. I do not agree with further restricting certain areas or cutting off some areas permanently. I've grown up going to Hatteras and Ocracoke, and I have always known to stay away from the Dunes and the Open Areas for the nesting of turtles and birds. What I worry about here is a slippery slope that would further restrict access and eventually take away our RIGHT to drive on the beaches and fish from these beaches. Without the ability to drive on the beaches, the access to surf fish would be greatly hindered. Across the country I am seeing areas taken away and denying the public to activities they have enjoyed for years. There should be some middle ground that all parties can agree with this issue.

Correspondence ID: 13928 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:30:47
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I personally don't like the idea. The beaches have enough problems with seawalls as it is, please don't add to those issues with allowing vehicles to compound the issues.

0012646

Correspondence ID: 13929 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Chip Connelly 1600 Anderson Road Glenshaw, PA 15116 I am an: ENVIRONMENTAL Landscape Architect and 55year friend/visitor of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. I am also a PBS Television Producer/Director

Correspondence ID: 13930 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Thank you,
Janet Rucker

Correspondence ID: 13931 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: conroy, kathleen m
Received: May,11,2010 14:32:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: This is a disaster. We need to be more careful when drilling. Better yet stop drilling in the ocean.

Correspondence ID: 13932 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have enjoyed traveling to North Carolina's seashore many times. The picturesque barrier islands are something to be protected. Please do not allow the off road vehicles to have access to Cape Hatteras. It will hurt wildlife and be a deterrent to pedestrians. Instead of this alternative, I wish you would support Alternative D if it is modified to include and recognize the following points.
1) The National Park Service cannot ignore its responsibilities under the Organic Act and the National Seashore's authorizing legislation to protect all visitors and wildlife and the habitat on which it depends. Conserving Cape Hatteras for future generations and protecting its wildlife must take precedence over one form of recreation (ORVs), and any recreational use is required by law to leave the resource "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."
2) When Cape Hatteras was established, Congress specifically designated it a park system unit for the following reason, "Except for certain portions of the area, deemed to be especially adaptable for recreational uses... , the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness...."
Thus, the intent of Congress was to protect the visitor experience of primitive wilderness, not ORV use. It is absolutely essential that NPS protect the pedestrian visitor experience to Cape Hatteras and allow ORV use only if it can occur without harming wilderness and wildlife resources.
3) The final Plan/EIS must assert NPS authority to adaptively manage the wildlife resources, in response to information produced by monitoring and analysis, to achieve wildlife species recovery goals.
Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the 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: 13933 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Whitney Bisbing 105 Swan Drive Currituck, NC 27929

Correspondence ID: 13934 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:35:56
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Sirs: I have lived on Hatteras Island for over 15 years and have visited here for over 30. I know that the best keepers of this fragile place are the people who choose to live here. It is a very difficult place to live, and the people who have chosen this place as home, cherish every life that is here. We know better than anyone what a tough place this is to make it in. We all love this island but we need to be able to make a living here too. I can't believe that a group of people that not only don't live here but most of whom have never visited here can dictate how we will be living. Not being able to walk on the beach, with or without our dogs, is ridiculous. Most of the people who live here or visit are willing to have some restrictions, all I am asking is that we meet in the middle. Please.

Correspondence ID: 13935 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Rouse, James

Received: May,11,2010 14:36:01
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: for twenty years, my family and i take 2 - week long vacations at ocracoke per year. some years more. If we are unable to drive on the beach, we will not go there any more. we spend on average 3500 dollars per visit, counting house rental. We fish, we read, we relax on the beach. And, we leave the beach cleaner than we found each trip as do most persons we encounter on the beach. outsiders should not be interfering with my enjoyment of nc resources.

Correspondence ID: 13936 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Meads, Edith
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
 Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
 1401 National Park Drive
 Manteo, NC 27954
 Dear Superintendent Murray,
 Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
 After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
 I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
 Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
 Edith Meads Kill Devil Hills, NC

Correspondence ID: 13937 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Pye, Doris
Received: May,11,2010 14:36:46
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please restore my right to enjoy Cape Point...the plan to protect birds that are not even endangered it completely crazy...You are taking away the most beautiful place on earth from my children and grandchildren for not reason at all.

Correspondence ID: 13938 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:37:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: The NPS must formulate a plan that is consistent with the legislation establishing Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. The enabling legislation for the Recreational Area states, in part, "said area shall be, and is, established, dedicated, and set apart as a national seashore recreational area for the benefit and enjoyment of the people and shall be known as the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area". Therefore, it is important to balance resource protection with reasonable access for recreation.
 Corridors are a vital tool in providing access while managing resources. They provide a small path around temporary resource closures in order to provide access to open areas that would otherwise be blocked. Corridors should be permitted throughout the seashore during the entire breeding and nesting season including ML-1 portions of SMAs. These corridors would provide valuable access without impairment or damage to protected resources. Buffers, or closures, are important management practices for species recovery. However, to have long term benefit for the wildlife and the visiting public, buffers must be based on peer-reviewed science For example, the Piping Plover, a species classified as threatened and not endangered, is given a level of unprecedented protection in Alternative F. A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions represents over 771 acres. The DEIS does not cite any peer-reviewed science in supporting such closure. A more appropriate & effective buffer would be 200 meters.
 Birds that are not listed as endangered should not be afforded the level of protection given to ESA (Endangered Species Act) protected species. Instead of 300-meter buffers for these birds, a more appropriate buffer would be 30 meters. Also, all birds in the same ecosystem of the seashore should be counted. This includes all the many birds on the dredge and spoil islands located just yards away and within sight of the seashore.
 The National Park Service should consider turtle management practices successfully used in other federal and state areas to achieve nesting success. More proactive measures include relocating nests to more desirable locations, which is routinely and successfully done in other areas.

Correspondence ID: 13939 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Covington, Wesley A
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Introduction
 The Recreational Fishing Alliance (RFA) is a national, 501(c)(4) non-profit grassroots political action organization that has been representing individual sport fishermen and the sport fishing industry since 1996. The RFA Mission is to safeguard the rights of saltwater anglers, protect marine, boat and tackle industry jobs and ensure the long-term sustainability of U.S. saltwater fisheries. RFA members include individual anglers, boat builders, fishing tackle manufacturers, party and charter boat businesses, bait and tackle retailers, marinas, and many other businesses in fishing communities. The South Carolina Chapter of RFA was created like all chapters of RFA- to build more local support and awareness of the RFA Mission.
 It is our understanding that a 2008 court order severely restricted off-road vehicle (ORV) and pedestrian access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area (CHNSRA) even though these beaches are very popular destinations for recreational fishing and other activities.
 Now, the National Park Service is considering much more restrictive regulations for this area despite the area being one of the most important surf fishing locations on the entire east coast of the United States.
 Not only anglers are affected by the proposed regulations that will restrict ORV access greatly. Consumers, business owners, taxpayers and citizens are impacted.
 Comments Regarding Socio-cultural, Economic and Legal Concerns
 The coastal economy of North Carolina is much like that of South Carolina's. The states depend heavily on outdoor recreation and tourism. While protection of the piping plover is important to users of this area as well as all citizens of this country, over regulation and over protection could never have been the intention of governmental policy and/or regulations. There's too much at stake for this to be the case.
 What's at stake is more than \$80 billion in sales of recreational fishing gear, over 500,000 jobs and over \$24 billion in income in this country directly resulting from recreational fishing each year. (Genter & Steinback)
 Even more compelling than national economic statistics is a relative comparison. While sportspersons, hunters and anglers are a minority of all recreationists in the United States, we spend almost twice as much money as wildlife watchers to partake in our recreational activities. (United States Fish and Wildlife Service, 2009)
 According to a 2007 study, just the amount of federal tax revenues generated by recreational angler spending in 2006 generated enough to nearly fund the US Environmental Protection Agency's entire 2006 budget- \$9 billion. (Southwick Associates, 2007)
 We arguably put our money where our mouths are when it comes to expenditures for activities as well as conservation efforts.
 In South Carolina, we made sure that all our saltwater fishing license revenues would go directly to our marine resources management, enhancement and protection. Hundreds of thousands of recreational fishing trips are made each year to our state Department of Natural Resources implemented and

managed artificial reefs, which were funded directly by our fishing license revenues. These reefs, as well as privately funded reefs also, would not have existed at all if not for us.

Recreational anglers and related business owners in South Carolina overwhelmingly support our natural resources management agency, and I submit to you that the sole reason for this entrustment of responsibility for over \$29 billion per year in economic impacts to South Carolina's economy from natural resources is this state agency's commitment to cooperating with and involving the public at all stages of regulation and policy making. We urge the National Park Service to adopt a similar attitude towards all stakeholders in its policy generation and regulation promulgation.

There must be legitimate science with full accounting of the socio-cultural and economic impacts, and if these exist, the recreational anglers and recreational fishing industry will fully support the initiatives sought.

The answers to the questions of conservation and sustainability should never lead straight to draconian type restrictions of our recreational access. They should instead consider creative ideas that include as many stakeholders as possible, and these stakeholders must first be informed and educated on government initiatives or plans in order for this to happen. Then, our environment as well as our recreation will benefit greatly together. We all share the same goals, and we've proven this repeatedly when our perspectives and contributions are embraced by policy makers.

South Carolina is ranked fifth among states for non-resident fishing destinations with non-resident expenditures exceeding \$370 million, and our state is also eighth in the country in recreational angler expenditures with nearly \$1.5 billion. Similarly, North Carolina ranks ninth in the United States in recreational angler expenditures with over \$1.2 billion per year. (Southwick Associates, 2007)

With this kind of social, cultural and economic value at stake, it is hard to understand why the National Park Service has not extended the public comment period for even 30 more days to allow more input from stakeholders who have only recently learned of the proposal. North Carolina's two U.S. Senators have both requested this extension, but the National Park Service has denied them apparently. Does the National Park Service really intend to go forward with this ORV Draft Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement when it is 810 pages long and only came out for public review on March 5, 2010?

This would be regrettable because it is our understanding that the preferred alternative, Alternative F, as outlined in the DEIS is the most restrictive management option to date, and it far exceeds any sense of balance between resource protection and public access. It is also our understanding that this approach contradicts all indications and promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore throughout the development process of this Management Plan. CHNSRA is one of the best recreational surf fishing locations on the east coast, and most of it is accessible only by ORV's. To unduly restrict ORV's would be unduly restrict recreational fishing. The President has directed the National Park Service to do everything in its power not to do just that.

On September 26, 2008, President G.W. Bush issued Executive Order No. 13474, which amended President Clinton's Executive Order No. 12962. The amended Executive Order explicitly directs in Section 1(d) that Federal agencies are to ensure, "... that recreational fishing shall be managed as a sustainable activity in national wildlife refuges, national parks, national monuments, national marine sanctuaries, marine protected areas, or any other relevant conservation or management areas or activities under any Federal authority, consistent with applicable law."

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. These provisions will have the effect of greatly restricting recreational fishing in a national park while two Presidential Orders have directed that recreational fishing be managed as a sustainable activity in national parks. The Orders directed that recreational fishing activities be enhanced- not curtailed. The proposals currently drafted by the National Park Service also raise issues regarding the public trust doctrine. The public trust doctrine is as old as Roman law, and it continues to remain as a dominant influence in our law today.

For example, South Carolina and North Carolina follow the riparian view of rights to water. Property rights, that is. Owners of property adjacent to our rivers and streams have rights to that water, but these do not include the right to impair downstream users' rights to this water. The public policy reasoning for this is the public trust doctrine holding that public or common use of water is more important than any individual use. It is important to remember that any allocation of rights to any individual interests necessarily takes away rights from the public. We are needless to say concerned about allocation of rights to those prioritizing protection of the piped plover, for lack of a better phrasing of certain parties' interests.

If the proposals by the National Park Service greatly restrict ORV access whereby recreational fishing is also greatly restricted as a matter of fact, it necessarily takes away rights the public once enjoyed. The public trust doctrine holds that the highest and most important use of certain resources is the public's use, and in this case that use has been for recreational activity- recreational shore fishing in particular.

Such direct impacts to the highest valued uses of public resources in our society not only harms individual liberties and rights previously enjoyed- the number of public users of our resources would also be greatly restricted. When society's highest valued users are restricted, we are therefore harmed socially, culturally and economically all at once. This greatly concerns us not just as recreational anglers and industry but as citizens of this state and country.

As recreational anglers and small business owners in the Carolinas, we are strongly opposed to Alternative F in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please make material changes in order to provide for resource protection as well as reasonable public access to public lands and resources.

Conclusion

Restriction of sustainable recreational fishing in our National Parks is at odds with several important things. These are socio-cultural and economic values, the public trust doctrine and United States Presidential Orders.

Recreational fishing has not been adequately represented for its economic, social and cultural value in the National Park Service's Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS for CHNSRA. The National Park Service should develop a consensus from as many interests as possible as it develops and recommends policy and regulations, and our strong concerns here should at least indicate that there is a great opportunity to be more inclusive of interests that are quite popular among the public not only in the Carolinas but in the entire country.

The Recreational Fishing Alliance and its South Carolina Chapter stand ready to assist you in this regard, and we appreciate the National Park Service's attention and consideration regarding our comments. Please extend the public comment period on this draft management plan and environmental impact statement, and please consider the opinions of those who put their money where their mouths are on these types of issues over and over again.

We are strongly opposed to Alternative F in the draft Environmental Impact Study. Please make material changes in order to provide for resource protection as well as reasonable public access to public lands, resources and sustainable recreational fishing activities.

Correspondence ID: 13940 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Cynthia Thompson 1748 White Mountain Road Afton, VA 22920

Correspondence ID: 13941 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,

0012649

Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.

I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.

Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Ian W. Lord 1748 White Mountain Road Afton, VA 22920

Correspondence ID: 13942 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Kenneth Hartman 1738 White Mountain Road Afton, VA 22920

Correspondence ID: 13943 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Carmen, Frank
Received: May,11,2010 14:39:05
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: We are voicing our opinion on the Deis/off road vehicle management plan that the national park service intends to manage for the next 15 years. STOP IT NOW. We own a beach home in Avon, NC. We have been going to the Outer Banks for well over 30 years. These changes you are making ie: closing Hatteras Inlet and the North End Ocracoke Island, Ramp 27-Ramp 30 Salvo are not for the good of the human population. The pipers could have more favorable space at the Cape Point ponds if you would clear the vegetation there. If the turtles are the problem then close the beach in that specific area only when the turtles are on the move. Why is it not ok to drive on the beach at night when this would be a deterrent to predators of turtles and birds. You killed other animals ie:raccoons and foxes but it's not ok to have a few turtle or pipers killed by accident. Why is the Audubon Society and their lawyers poking their noses on our island now. Things have been fine for the last 30+ years that we have been there. The way the island is run should be up to the homeowners/businesses not outsiders. If you pass all the closings/buffers it will mean the end of the Outer Banks. We bring numerous friends/fishermen to the area and they all spend money to fish and drive on the beach. They won't come. We will have to sell our home there and you won't have the tax revenue which greatly effects the rest of North Carolina as well. Business's will have to close. More people will be out of work. North Carolina will be another poorer state. But it will have a ton of turtles and Piping plovers. Let's see how much taxes they pay. Man has the ability to move these creatures out of the way and let us go on with our right to use the beaches. Let's not let new comers ie: The Audubon Society and their lawyers change something that has been working well all ready. Everyone we know has used beach respect at all times. The Society has created a problem when there wasn't one. It all comes down to money and who has more. Surely in today's world there are bigger problems for them to poke their noses in. We need the county and state of NC to stand behind it's homeowner's and businesses.
Sincerely,
Frank Carmen

Correspondence ID: 13944 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Catherine Buck 1738 White Mountain Road Afton, VA 22920

Correspondence ID: 13945 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:39:27
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Any "final" managment plan must fully respect community rights to access and use of the "national" seashore as well as the economic impacts on those communties and homeowners resident and non-resident.(I am a non-resident homowner who comes to the OBX throughout the year to windsurf, fish, and hunt and bring significant numbers of people with me.) This is what the US and US ngos preach to the rest of the world and too often it is not applied at home in the US. yes there is a need to balance ORV traffic and conservation - conservation based on good science and constructive interpretation of the ESA. Are ORVs the real problem regarding birds as compared to endemic natural predators and feral and non-feral cats? What is the balance and if cats should there not be a feral cat extermination program. Sea turtles are another issue requiring different ORV strategies than birds. How many birds have been killed by ORVs?
In sum there is a need to balance the needs of people and communities and conservation -they are the ones looking out for the real interests of the seashore. Conservation that does not serve the interests as well does not result in effective conservation nor human wellbeing. Noe of the proposed plans provides that balance.

Correspondence ID: 13946 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.

Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Micheal Klepper 238 Clarks Tract Keswick, VA 20947

Correspondence ID:	13947	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Rucker, Joyce M				
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.</p> <p>Joyce Rucker Buxton, NC</p>				
Correspondence ID:	13948	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	N/A, N/A				
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.</p> <p>Bernie Dracopoli Hackingwood Lane Keswick, VA 20947</p>				
Correspondence ID:	13949	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	N/A, N/A				
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.</p> <p>Nancy Dimock 500 Lodebar Estates Nellysford, VA 22958</p>				
Correspondence ID:	13950	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	N/A, N/A				
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.</p> <p>Elliott Thompson 90 Southwest Road Canterbury, NH 03224</p>				
Correspondence ID:	13951	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Torres, J.				
Received:	May,11,2010 14:43:04				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>Mr. Mike Murray Superintendent, Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954 Dear Supt. Murray: I am in favor of a permit system to regulate ORV beach use and I am in favor of sensible beach closures to protect nesting birds. But, there has to be another way to protect nesting birds and turtles and other resources within the Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore other than the draconian measures outlined in the Seashore's Draft Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan/EIS (DEIS). These measures will kill the local economy on Hatteras Island, and ultimately kill the Seashore as a National Park when visitors stop coming. I would hope the National Park Service can compromise on its plans for extensive beach closures as its preferred solution to protecting the bird and turtle nests. The solutions presented in the Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement, which has been submitted to you, would give the Park Service a much more equitable basis for wildlife and species protection, and yet continue to protect the resources within the Seashore. Please incorporate the Coalition's options into the Seashore's final ORV management plan.</p> <p>Thank you, J. Torres Buxton NC</p>				
Correspondence ID:	13952	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Blakney, Harold				
Received:	May,11,2010 14:44:11				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	<p>I disagree with the NPS buffers used for breeding, nesting and unfledged chicks. The numbers derived do not come from proven distances, rather just from an arbitrary and overly excessive distance that would severely restrict access through the narrow corridors that often exist on high tides and during times of excessive erosion from storms. Bypasses or corridors could continue to be provided through, around, or below high tide line for all SMAs during entire breeding and nesting season to maintain access to critical historical and cultural areas. This can and has been done historically within</p>				

guidelines and without adverse impact to birds. There are significant reductions in the proposed buffers that could be used and should be flexible to accommodate different species. These buffers should also move as the brood moves to accommodate access. One example of an excessive buffer is for the breeding piping plover at 75m which would be sufficient at 50m. The unfledged piping plover buffer of 1000m is extremely excessive and should be reduced to a reasonable 200m. Having a more reasonable as well as a flexible buffer will help provide DEIS with an object to improve visitor experiences and access as well as its success with resource protection. Some other initiative that could be focused on to aid in access while providing resource protection would be to manage habitat and vegetation as to promote (not deter) bird breeding environments. Improve predator deterrents and management. And to be flexible in the buffers as to provide economically essential access to historically critical areas.

Correspondence ID: 13953 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.
Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Thomas E & Judith A Hammernik
40273 Beachcomber Dr. South
Avon, NC 27915

Correspondence ID: 13954 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Wancko, Ronald J
Received: May,11,2010 14:46:04

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I have been fishing on the beaches of the Outer Banks for over 30 years and have never harmed a single bird as far as I know. There are plenty of places for the birds to nest without barring humans from enjoying the very park land that was dedicated for public use so many years ago.
The people who have pushed for the closure of our public beaches on the Outer Banks of NC have not used sound environmental science as a basis for their actions. Please please inject some sanity into this situation and stop the trend that is ruining the economy of the area for no valid reason at all.

Correspondence ID: 13955 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Sincerely, Jonathon Goold

Correspondence ID: 13956 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:47:09

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: The ORV access to the beaches on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore should be maintained. I am opposed to the hyper-sensitivity I have experienced since the NPS began restricting access to the beaches just a few years ago. With the exaggerated separation of human use of the beach and wildlife use of the beach we are inappropriately balancing the impact on humans and the impact on wildlife. The economic impact to Hatteras Island residents should be weighed heavily in this matter as well as the human value of the recreational use of the national beaches. I fear that the importance of the separation between the human and wildlife usage is being given too much importance on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID: 13957 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:47:26

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray:
Mike, we are living at a time when it has become "politically incorrect" to dispute or even question anything presented to us concerning the environment.
The people of the Outer Banks are struggling with this...they want to protect a way of life, a place they love, and the land where they have been good stewards for generations.
Unfortunately, this fight to keep access open has put them in an awkward position - it has labeled them as being on the wrong side of the environmental fence.
I simply ask - please keep access open. Allow those that love this place to be involved in protecting it. Let us continue to make memories and pass to the next generation a deep love and respect for all that makes up the Cape Hatteras Recreational Seashore. That cannot be accomplished from afar...
Thank you. Pat Mullinax (frequent visitor)

Correspondence ID: 13958 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray,
Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.
After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document.
I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule

making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Correspondence ID:	13959	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Robert M. High						
Correspondence ID:	13960	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Please accept this as my comment on the ORV DEIS. I disagree with all of the six alternatives within the document. I have 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. In particular, I have a hard time understanding the reason for such large buffers. Why is so much area needed? I believe the distance stated in the Coalition For Beach Access Position Statement is fair to all parties involved. The Coalition's Statement will protect wildlife while still allowing the people of Hatteras and Ocracoke the area needed to economically survive. Please consider all aspects of the Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you.						
Correspondence ID:	13961	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	
Name:	Fail, Anne Marie						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Anne Marie Fail						
Correspondence ID:	13962	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 14:50:12						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I am a lifelong resident of Chesapeake, VA and i have been driving down to the outer banks for surfing and fishing year round for over 20years. The beaches of the Outer Banks are a state and national treasure. I support the idea of protecting the beaches and the native wildlife for generations to come. Closing down the beaches for off road traffic should not be the only option. Education of the importance in maintaining the beaches is bound to be more effective. Over the years I have seen the commitment of all of the visitors to the outer banks by treading softly on mother earth, picking up their trash, and avoiding wildlife preserve areas. The majority of erosion is due to mother nature herself and her constant change. When I was a boy Oregon Inlet was a huge beach. Now it is practically gone. Vehicles were not the major cause in this erosion. Please reconsider the option of closing the beaches.						
Correspondence ID:	13963	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	Y
Name:	private						
Received:	May,11,2010 14:51:35						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	I am for reasonable protection of "endangered" wildlife based on the latest true scientific information. I am not for the same stringent regulations and beach closures for non-endangered wildlife. I would recommend that the beaches associated with Hatteras Inlet, Oregon Inlet and Ocracoke Inlets should not be totally closed. These Inlet areas are constantly vulnerable to washovers, whether from strong northerly or southerly winds. Extreme protective measures can't stop the wind and surf and are a complete waste of our tax dollars. Since the "decree" has been in place, Cape Hatteras has been transformed from a place that I could really get away and relax into a place that I would personally describe as a police state where someone is always looking over my shoulder. Last year I was "checked" three times on the same day by Park Rangers or Marine Fisheries (twice by the same Ranger on the same day). In conclusion, I am for the Parke Service to use some common sense to manage Cape Hatteras and it recources not a 800 page surround and confuse DEIS recommndation compiled by extremist using faulty scientific information. Any time I see such a monstrosity, I smell something fishy						
Correspondence ID:	13964	Project:	10641	Document:	32596	Private:	
Name:	Midgett, Timothy W						
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00						
Correspondence Type:	Web Form						
Correspondence:	On behalf of Midgett Realty and Midgett Brothers Inc., I respectfully submit our position on the draft ORV management plan/EIS. Midgett Realty is a family owned company whose roots began in 1938 when two brothers began the only source of public transportation on the island. Now, some sixty plus years later, we own the largest real estate company on the island together with a number of other related businesses including marinas, restaurants, shopping centers, a construction company and some others. We employ some 75-100 folks on a year-round basis and about double that during the peak seasons. It is now a 3rd generation family business in the throes of extinction due to governmental intervention. Our businesses are totally reliable on the tourism industry. Given the recent closures of the island beaches due to the ongoing "plans" put forth by the Park Service, or lack thereof, our business has suffered considerable losses of revenue in every area; especially during the much needed "off-seasons" when beach closures are at the peak.						

The fact that the traditional and historic uses of the Park are being threatened by well-funded environmental organizations and the proven lackadaisical effort by the NPS is tantamount to a criminal act. Access to and use of the beaches was part and parcel of the original creation of the park as the Nation's first National Seashore park; The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Please explain how/when/where/who determined, unilaterally, that the park's name and use shall be changed forever?? All under the pretense of democracy??

The efforts to manage bird activities on the beaches and to severely restrict beach access for the human population is very much without merit. The restrictions as delineated by the "Consent Decree" have already practically decimated the tourism industry on Hatteras and Ocracoke islands. These efforts were undertaken without adequate science to support the decision-making and have absolutely ignored the impacts upon commerce. Any purported true study of the economic impact analysis would most certainly indicate tremendous impacts upon the tourism population.

A close look at most any area business financial statement for the past couple of years will clearly indicate that the financial impacts are literally "off-the-charts". By that, I mean that those businesses have suffered considerable loss of income and their balance sheets clearly reflect the declines of previous years. No, this is NOT the result of the economic downturn, it is a 'cause and effect' situation derived directly from government intervention. Let's face the facts - most, if not all, commerce on Hatteras Island is a direct result of tourism. As visitation diminishes due to restricted access, the fishermen either stay at home or travel to another area where they can do their thing. This equates to losses of revenue to the area businesses. When revenues decline, business owners are forced to take drastic measures to survive - this leads to serious decreases in employment as owners eliminate positions. We at Midgett Realty have had to make some very difficult decisions and have been forced to lay off several key employees. There will be more to come if government is successful in destroying the goose that lays the golden egg.....TOURISM.

If 'big brother' chooses to do a study on the economics of Hatteras Island, please see that there is just a bit of integrity and science involved. Don't continue with the banter about "minimal impacts" thinking you are fooling the population - those antics do little to assuage the fears of an island under siege and looking at the demise of the only industry that exists out here.

We strongly encourage NPS and it's cohorts in this mess to consider the bird populations on the many adjacent dredge spoil islands lying nearby. That is where the predominant populations of shorebirds choose to nest. Go take a look at these islands, count the birds. Hey, let's face it, they can't read all the little signs posted every few feet along practically every shoreline there is on Hatteras and Ocracoke -instead the birds seek and find adequate habitat in which to do their thing, oftentimes away from the influence of mankind.

We support more and larger corridors than identified within the DEIS. Access is critical to the future of the islands. Similarly, we support much smaller closure areas after determining 'a bird may be exhibiting signs of mating or nesting'. Along those same lines, we noticed that government has exceeded it's call for action and is kindly providing protection for bird species that had been identified by the great state of North Carolina as being of concern due to smaller populations. These species are NOT protected nor endangered in the true sense. It seems that this is yet another over-reach by the long arms of government when the Park endeavors to add these species to their protections and closures. Does it appear there is a pattern here?

We have witnessed a massive undertaking by the federal government here on Hatteras Island the past couple of years. They have amassed an army of federal enforcement agents from across America, placed them in enough vehicles to keep Detroit working, paid untold dollars to house the employees while on assignment, fed them, killed a literal forest of trees to secure the necessary 2 X 2's to delineate hundreds of miles of shoreline.....all in the best interests of very few birds and a couple of turtles. Taxpayer's are seeing millions of dollars wasted during a time when the national debt is spiraling out of control.

In summary, Midgett Realty supports the positions of the alliance. We need adequate beach access. We applaud the tireless efforts of the fine folks who have given of their valuable time and energies to work for a cause that defies common sense. Similarly, we are aligned with our elected officials who have tread the halls of Congress seeking the democratic process. We extend a big thank-you to our Dare County commissioners, Senator Basnight and all the others who have stepped up for the cause of free and open access to America's first National Seashore for her citizens.

Tim Midgett PO Box 250 Hatteras, NC 27943

Correspondence ID: 13965 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:52:25
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: 13966 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:52:25
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

0012654

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

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

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

Correspondence ID: 13967 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:52:32
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: 13968 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:53:51
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As year round residents of Hatteras Island for the past 19 years and as regular visitors to the island starting in 1983, we would like to offer the following comments on the DEIS Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan:
- We have enjoyed visiting National Parks around the country for the past 27 years, the openness of these American treasures is one of their most attractive features. It is unconscionable to close large areas of a National Park that has been created and preserved for the enjoyment of the citizens of this country.
- We find it especially egregious that ORVs will be prohibited year round between Ramps 27-30, Hatteras Inlet(Hatteras Spit), North Ocreacoke Spit and various other locations. These are prime fishing and recreational areas, and provision for access by ORVs should be incorporated on the ORV Plan.(pages 97-101)
- We would also ask you to reduce the size of the buffer areas (pages 121 - 127). 1,000 meters is excessive. Something more like 200 meters would be reasonable. Sea turtle nests could simply be identified and fenced off with a much smaller buffer area. In fact, in Akumal, Mexico, where there is a major sea turtle research center, the center employees actually dig up the turtle eggs and relocate them to a safe location while they are incubating.
- There should, in our opinion, be no restriction on leashed pets at anytime during the year(page 136). The ability to bring pets to the beach is one of the greatest freedoms and strongest attractions of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore for many visitors and residents.
- We would advocate that any restricted areas have ORV corridors through them.
- Pedestrian access should be allowed in all locations on Hatteras and Ocracoke islands (page 121). Restricting pedestrian access is unreasonable and unduly restrictive.
The theme of our comments as you can see is to preserve as much of the access to all areas of Hatteras and Ocracoke islands as possible. This was the original policy and intent when the national seashore was formed, and this legacy should be preserved.
We look forward to your reasonable and favorable decisions on these matters.

Correspondence ID: 13969 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:54:50
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I have carefully read the document and all of the recommended alternatives, including the one preferred by the Park Service. I am currently a property owner in the village of Avon, and have owned property off and on on the Outer Banks since 1969. I also spend a large amount of time fishing and hunting all over the North America and Canada. Thus it is difficult for me to understand how the NPS can recommend permanent closure of ANY area to ANY activity for 20 years when they nor anyone else can predict how the barrier island will look in 20 years! I also find the document above rather confusing and full of nature science based on outdated studies and studies done in beach environments that have no relationship to the North Carolina barrier islands. I find that the Coalition for Beach Access, in approx. 77 pages has come up with a more flexible and realistic plan that can be implemented with less work and can also, in my opinion, adapt as the wildlife and the geography of the barrier islands changes over the next twenty years. I therefore urge the NPS to carefully consider and include the recommendations of the Coalition in any final plan. Also, it seems strange to me that an area originally designated as a recreation area as opposed to a wildlife area, does not take into consideration the people and the villages that will be impacted by any changes to the park areas. Closing approx. 26 miles permanently and other areas on a "as need" basis will have a detrimental effect on property rentals, property values, business growth and tax based revenues for the area over the next 20 years that, to my mind, is more important than whether piping plover(not native to the area)increases in nesting activity. Speaking of wildlife and economic impact, can you explain why the entire region from Duck to Ocracoke was used for economic impact study, but only the area of Cape Hatteras National Park was used for wildlife impact? What is good for one, should be good for all. I don't care which area the NPS uses, but you have to be consistent in my mind. Thank you.

Correspondence ID: 13970 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: brabham, lorraine
Received: May,11,2010 14:55:13
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please either limit or outlaw the use of vehicles at Cape Hatteras....saving our extraordinary beaches is far more important than running them down to nothing!!

Correspondence ID: 13971 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:56:54
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: As a long-time visitor to the Cape Hatteras/Ocracoke recreational area, I have an intense interest in the proposed Draft Environmental Impact Study (DEIS) and the possibility of it becoming law.
It is alarming that the Piping Plover (that seeks out human habitation areas to nest and is not indigenous to the Outer Banks) is given 700 acres of restricted area for each nest. The American Oystercatcher, also covered in this study, is in no way threatened. These two bird species have received protection way beyond what is reasonable and borders on disbelief. Examples of this are:
Over 1000 mammals including domestic cats have been killed in the name of protecting less than one dozen piping plovers. These mammals include foxes, raccoons and opossums that are indigenous to the area. This has resulted in an imbalance in nature and rabbits are now breeding out of control and doing extensive damage to the vegetation in this fragile environment. This will result in the loss of vegetation that prevents beach erosion.
Due to the closure of the beach areas for many weeks and the fact that visitors can not have a dog on the beach (not on a leash or any other way -- no dogs on the beaches) tourism has dropped dramatically. In an area where unemployment is 17+% this is devastating.
I urge you to reconsider these draconian laws.

Correspondence ID: 13972 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 14:57:22
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: First, I would like to give you some background info on the history of the relationship between the Outer Banks of North Carolina and my family. From this, my hope is that you will ascertain how special this place is to us. Our first trip was to Kitty Hawk in 1964. That began a span of approximately 8-10 years of Outer Banks vacations with extended family. We stayed in oceanfront cottages in Kitty Hawk, KDH, and Nags Head. We made occasional trips to Hatteras Island for the day. The island back then was quaint and had character that I have never seen anywhere else. The fall of 1977 was the first year for a week of surf fishing and camaraderie with family. It has continued every year since, losing some family members along the way to old age, but gaining new fisherman from the family and sometimes friends as well. In 1986, my wife and I purchased a lot in Kinnakeet Shores in Avon. We had looked at property from the Georgia to the Virginia shoreline. In the end we came back to our beach roots, because of its uniqueness. We built a home on our property in 2000. It is currently a rental vacation home that perhaps we will occupy on a semi-permanent basis some day. In looking back since that first trip in 1964, Hatteras Island has changed immensely. Uncontrolled growth has taken its toll. Much of the uniqueness is gone forever. Sadly, the island's character has been diluted to a fraction of what it once was. Now island life is under assault once again due to issues of beach access being pushed by certain environmental groups. We believe the actions of these groups are sole reason NPS has created DEIS and thus we would not be having this conversation otherwise. We certainly are not environmental zealots and by the same token are not anti-environment. We have environmental concerns about the preservation of life's essentials, including all God's creatures. Those concerns should be addressed with rational, well thought out solutions, backed by scientific merit. However we feel options A thru F of DEIS do not fall under any of the above criteria. Options A thru F are draconian in dealing with these preservation issues and will result in long term harm to the economy and way of life of Hatteras Island while at the same time doing little to address preservation issues. They also do not take into consideration any prior regulations from 1937-2008, which stated the expressed purpose of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore was to provide recreational activities for all. I have driven with an ORV on the beaches for 23 years. Not once during that time have I seen damage to wildlife caused by ORV use. We are not sure the preservation issues even exist, because we have not been presented with any evidence of such, and without a valid scientific timeframe of many years versus the documented snapshot of the last several years. If in fact the issues are real, the people and their ORV use are some of the less likely causes, but yet because we are the easiest to affect, the penalties you are asking people to pay are draconian in nature and more damaging to Hatteras Island in general, but at the same time will have minimal impact on hypothetical preservation issues. We are in firm support of increased regulation that is rational in dealing with potential preservation issues similar to statement published by Coalition for Beach Access or some other less damaging alternative other than any of the 6 DEIS alternatives. In the meantime, rational scientific examination of the preservation issues needs to be undertaken. The environmental groups have demonstrated by past island actions, that they will settle for nothing less than a total ban on beach access regardless of hardships and the negative impact their policies will create. And once the bar is set, despite periodic review, access will never return to rational levels. We implore the NPS to go slow and be prudent in regulating this issue and continue to monitor and gather pertinent information. There are many intertwined issues that need to be addressed, including the feral cat problem, beach and dune preservation and unrestricted growth and development on the island. It is better to limit the number of people on the island than to restrict what the people on the island are able to do. These are but a few of many. We realize that many contributors to this issue lie outside the realm of the NPS. Thank you for your time in reading this.
Respectfully,
Tim and Jean Markey

Correspondence ID: 13973 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Kuehnel, Robert H
Received: May,11,2010 14:57:40
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I am a frequent visitor to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, and I would prefer that the beaches at CHNS be as restrictive as possible with respect to off road vehicle use.
I fish the surf, and walk my (leashed) dog on the beaches, and I do not appreciate the presence of ORVs on the beaches. I am very much concerned about the long-term welfare of the seabirds that nest near the beaches, as well as the sea turtles that nest on the beach. Our shores along the Atlantic coast have been excessively developed, and there are few places left for these creatures to nest successfully. The CHNS should remain one of them. The long term financial welfare of the outer banks communities will be better served by keeping the area from being overused and overdeveloped, and keeping ORVs as much off the beaches as possible will serve this long term good. I, for one, will visit more often, and spend more freely, if the beaches are kept environmentally intact.
I urge you to opt for the alternative that most limits ORVs on the beaches.

Correspondence ID: 13974 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Crews, Moriah
Received: May,11,2010 14:58:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not allow motor vehicles on NC beaches. I regularly visit New Smyrna Beach in Florida, where beach driving is allowed. Both ORVs and cars are allowed, but I believe even ORVs on their own would have numerous negative impacts.
1. In my opinion, the fact that allowing vehicles on the beach compromises the safety and habitat of its resident non-human animals is more than enough

reason to keep cars off the beach. 2. But if more reason is really needed, vehicles on the beach pose a safety hazard for humans as well. Kids running around on the beach are essentially playing in a parking lot, which responsible parents would normally not allow. I realize a speed limit would be enforced, but drivers are easily distracted. 3. Allowing vehicles on the beach also brings their pollution that much closer to the sensitive marine environment. 4. Vehicles hasten erosion of the beach. 5. Residents of the coastal towns will also be negatively affected from increased traffic and noise pollution.

I think it would be unwise to compromise the safety and health of our beaches and marine animals just so tourists can tool around on gas powered vehicles.

Regards, Moriah Crews Raleigh, NC

Correspondence ID: 13975 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Deibel, Carolyn R
Received: May,11,2010 14:59:55
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.
We have been enjoying Cape Hatteras for over 30 years and do NOT want to see its beauty and tranquility spoiled by ORV drivers who think the convenience of driving on to the beach preempts preserving this beautiful area.

Correspondence ID: 13976 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: green, jeff
Received: May,11,2010 15:00:02
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Short and simple. I enjoy the outer banks. Many families depend on the tourism industry of the North Carolina Outer Banks to survive. So far they've been financially hurt, but by restricting beach access further you are destroying their way life. For what? A couple of species of birds that thrive in other states. I'm totally against any additional closures to the National Seashore as a result of some animal rights group.

Correspondence ID: 13977 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I fully support the Coalition for Beach Access.

Correspondence ID: 13978 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 15:01:15
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I strongly endorse a management plan that allows unimpeded pedestrian access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches. Unimpeded access should be interpreted as a person having the freedom to chose whenever and whatever beaches they would like to walk, run, move about, lounge, sit, etc. It is understood that the beaches should be available to all species, not restricted to a certain sub-set. The vast majority of U.S. citizens who pay taxes that finance NPS activities do so with the implied understanding that national seashore beaches are open and available to the general public regardless of the time of year.
Given the increase of individual obesity rates in the United States over the previous 25 years the NPS needs to encourage physical activity at Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches. Ensuring that all of the beaches are continually open and available for recreational exercise needs to be included as part of any final approved management plan.

Correspondence ID: 13979 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Plasse, Ernest
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
May 5, 2010
Mr. Murray,
It has been brought to the attention of the kiteboarding community that a variety of plans are being considered in response to proposed environmental and ecological concerns. The Outer Banks of North Carolina is a sanctuary for many beach goers, sports enthusiasts, wildlife observers and most importantly, the natural environment. We, as a community, feel that it is important for the environment to be protected and thus understand certain steps may be needed to achieve this goal. Thank you for evaluating the options to improve the environmental conditions at one of the greatest destinations in the United States of America.
However, with the aforementioned said, please consider the responses you choose carefully. Minimalist environmental management approaches have worked well throughout the United States' National Parks. Closing extensive sections of beaches, the sound, and water ways will strip away the very nature and reason for why we appreciate the land in its current state. It can be said with great certainty that all frequent and casual users of this place intend to preserve its natural beauty and respect its wildlife.
We strongly feel that the Historical, Cultural, and Economic ramifications of the proposed plans have not been adequately addressed by the Draft

Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) as is required.

Should the environmental changes impact our communities' sport (as it would in Plans D, E, & F) we would be forced to reconsider our frequent and environmentally friendly utilization of the Outer Banks. Other user groups such as surfers, fishermen, beachcombers, and virtually all other forms of tourism will also be discouraged from visiting Cape Hatteras if beach closures are greatly expanded. This will have a severely negative impact on the local economy and way of life that the residents of Hatteras Island have enjoyed for many generations. It will also take away something that is important to the lives of thousands of people throughout the United States and around the world.

If people, and especially children, can not experience the environment how are they going to learn to help you protect the environment? Ernest & Margaret Plasse Seaview Drive Hatteras, NC

Correspondence ID: 13980 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 15:02:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I very strongly support open and accessible beaches for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I do support the resource protection for the shorebirds and sea turtles when it is based on unbiased comprehensive science while still providing complete open access for human activity in the seashore.

The following is a list of things that I think need to be addressed in the Management plan and are not. I am sure there is more that needs to be addressed but I do not have the ability to review an 800 page document during my limited spare time.

1. Access corridors for vehicles and pedestrians should be provided through closure area in order to gain access to areas that may be open on the other side. The corridors can be at or near the high tide line with enough space for access and use of this area.
2. The management buffers are accessive and there is not adequate science to keep them at 1000 meters. The buffers need to be based on peer reviewed science and still provide public access through these closure areas.
3. The turtle management plan could easily implement a relocation program that would provide a higher survival rate and remove the turtles from dangerous storm events. My wife worked for the NPS in Sebastian and Wabasso Florida were this was done routinely and it works.
4. This document does not adequately address the economic harm that has been caused and will continue to cause if these issues are not considered. The document states there will be "negligible to moderate" adverse impacts to the local economy. I believe this is completely inaccurate and is an insult to all the people who suffered economical throughout the outer banks community.

I know a great deal of hard work has been put into this DEIS but for the average person who has a job and family it is impossible for anyone to review and understand this information in the time that was given. If this is supposed to be for the public benefit it should be and easier process to review. In Summary there should complete open access whith managed corridors for vehicles and pedestrians during resource closures.

Correspondence ID: 13981 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Covington, Wesley A

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Sources included this time- left out in first comment submission a few minutes ago.

Introduction

The Recreational Fishing Alliance (RFA) is a national, 501(c)(4) non-profit grassroots political action organization that has been representing individual sport fishermen and the sport fishing industry since 1996. The RFA Mission is to safeguard the rights of saltwater anglers, protect marine, boat and tackle industry jobs and ensure the long-term sustainability of U.S. saltwater fisheries. RFA members include individual anglers, boat builders, fishing tackle manufacturers, party and charter boat businesses, bait and tackle retailers, marinas, and many other businesses in fishing communities. The South Carolina Chapter of RFA was created like all chapters of RFA- to build more local support and awareness of the RFA Mission.

It is our understanding that a 2008 court order severely restricted off-road vehicle (ORV) and pedestrian access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area (CHNSRA) even though these beaches are very popular destinations for recreational fishing and other activities.

Now, the National Park Service is considering much more restrictive regulations for this area despite the area being one of the most important surf fishing locations on the entire east coast of the United States.

Not only anglers are affected by the proposed regulations that will restrict ORV access greatly. Consumers, business owners, taxpayers and citizens are impacted.

Comments Regarding Socio-cultural, Economic and Legal Concerns

The coastal economy of North Carolina is much like that of South Carolina's. The states depend heavily on outdoor recreation and tourism. While protection of the piping plover is important to users of this area as well as all citizens of this country, over regulation and over protection could never have been the intention of governmental policy and/or regulations. There's too much at stake for this to be the case.

What's at stake is more than \$80 billion in sales of recreational fishing gear, over 500,000 jobs and over \$24 billion in income in this country directly resulting from recreational fishing each year. (Genter & Steinback)

Even more compelling than national economic statistics is a relative comparison. While sportspersons, hunters and anglers are a minority of all recreationists in the United States, we spend almost twice as much money as wildlife watchers to partake in our recreational activities. (United States Fish and Wildlife Service, 2009)

According to a 2007 study, just the amount of federal tax revenues generated by recreational angler spending in 2006 generated enough to nearly fund the US Environmental Protection Agency's entire 2006 budget- \$9 billion. (Southwick Associates, 2007)

We arguably put our money where our mouths are when it comes to expenditures for activities as well as conservation efforts.

In South Carolina, we made sure that all our saltwater fishing license revenues would go directly to our marine resources management, enhancement and protection. Hundreds of thousands of recreational fishing trips are made each year to our state Department of Natural Resources implemented and managed artificial reefs, which were funded directly by our fishing license revenues. These reefs, as well as privately funded reefs also, would not have existed at all if not for us.

Recreational anglers and related business owners in South Carolina overwhelmingly support our natural resources management agency, and I submit to you that the sole reason for this entrustment of responsibility for over \$29 billion per year in economic impacts to South Carolina's economy from natural resources is this state agency's commitment to cooperating with and involving the public at all stages of regulation and policy making. We urge the National Park Service to adopt a similar attitude towards all stakeholders in its policy generation and regulation promulgation.

There must be legitimate science with full accounting of the socio-cultural and economic impacts, and if these exist, the recreational anglers and recreational fishing industry will fully support the initiatives sought.

The answers to the questions of conservation and sustainability should never lead straight to draconian type restrictions of our recreational access. They should instead consider creative ideas that include as many stakeholders as possible, and these stakeholders must first be informed and educated on government initiatives or plans in order for this to happen. Then, our environment as well as our recreation will benefit greatly together. We all share the same goals, and we've proven this repeatedly when our perspectives and contributions are embraced by policy makers.

South Carolina is ranked fifth among states for non-resident fishing destinations with non-resident expenditures exceeding \$370 million, and our state is also eighth in the country in recreational angler expenditures with nearly \$1.5 billion. Similarly, North Carolina ranks ninth in the United States in recreational angler expenditures with over \$1.2 billion per year. (Southwick Associates, 2007)

With this kind of social, cultural and economic value at stake, it is hard to understand why the National Park Service has not extended the public comment period for even 30 more days to allow more input from stakeholders who have only recently learned of the proposal. North Carolina's two U.S. Senators have both requested this extension, but the National Park Service has denied them apparently. Does the National Park Service really intend to go forward with this ORV Draft Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement when it is 810 pages long and only came out for public review on March 5, 2010?

This would be regrettable because it is our understanding that the preferred alternative, Alternative F, as outlined in the DEIS is the most restrictive management option to date, and it far exceeds any sense of balance between resource protection and public access. It is also our understanding that this approach contradicts all indications and promises made to the public regarding recreational uses in the seashore throughout the development process of this Management Plan. CHNSRA is one of the best recreational surf fishing locations on the east coast, and most of it is accessible only by ORV's. To unduly restrict ORV's would be unduly restrict recreational fishing. The President has directed the National Park Service to do everything in its power not to do just that.

On September 26, 2008, President G.W. Bush issued Executive Order No. 13474, which amended President Clinton's Executive Order No. 12962. The amended Executive Order explicitly directs in Section 1(d) that Federal agencies are to ensure, ". . . that recreational fishing shall be managed as a sustainable activity in national wildlife refuges, national parks, national monuments, national marine sanctuaries, marine protected areas, or any other relevant conservation or management areas or activities under any Federal authority, consistent with applicable law."

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. These provisions will have the effect of greatly restricting recreational fishing in a national park while two Presidential Orders have directed that recreational fishing be managed as a sustainable activity in national parks. The Orders directed that recreational fishing activities be enhanced- not curtailed. The proposals currently drafted by the National Park Service also raise issues regarding the public trust doctrine. The public trust doctrine is as old as Roman law, and it continues to remain as a dominant influence in our law today.

For example, South Carolina and North Carolina follow the riparian view of rights to water. Property rights, that is. Owners of property adjacent to our rivers and streams have rights to that water, but these do not include the right to impair downstream users' rights to this water. The public policy reasoning for this is the public trust doctrine holding that public or common use of water is more important than any individual use. It is important to remember that any allocation of rights to any individual interests necessarily takes away rights from the public. We are needless to say concerned about allocation of rights to those prioritizing protection of the piped plover, for lack of a better phrasing of certain parties' interests.

If the proposals by the National Park Service greatly restrict ORV access whereby recreational fishing is also greatly restricted as a matter of fact, it necessarily takes away rights the public once enjoyed. The public trust doctrine holds that the highest and most important use of certain resources is the public's use, and in this case that use has been for recreational activity- recreational shore fishing in particular.

Such direct impacts to the highest valued uses of public resources in our society not only harms individual liberties and rights previously enjoyed- the number of public users of our resources would also be greatly restricted. When society's highest valued users are restricted, we are therefore harmed socially, culturally and economically all at once. This greatly concerns us not just as recreational anglers and industry but as citizens of this state and country.

As recreational anglers and small business owners in the Carolinas, we are strongly opposed to Alternative F in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. Please make material changes in order to provide for resource protection as well as reasonable public access to public lands and resources.

Conclusion

Restriction of sustainable recreational fishing in our National Parks is at odds with several important things. These are socio-cultural and economic values, the public trust doctrine and United States Presidential Orders.

Recreational fishing has not been adequately represented for its economic, social and cultural value in the National Park Service's Draft ORV Management Plan/EIS for CHNSRA. The National Park Service should develop a consensus from as many interests as possible as it develops and recommends policy and regulations, and our strong concerns here should at least indicate that there is a great opportunity to be more inclusive of interests that are quite popular among the public not only in the Carolinas but in the entire country.

The Recreational Fishing Alliance and its South Carolina Chapter stand ready to assist you in this regard, and we appreciate the National Park Service's attention and consideration regarding our comments. Please extend the public comment period on this draft management plan and environmental impact statement, and please consider the opinions of those who put their money where their mouths are on these types of issues over and over again.

We are strongly opposed to Alternative F in the draft Environmental Impact Study. Please make material changes in order to provide for resource protection as well as reasonable public access to public lands, resources and sustainable recreational fishing activities.

Sources

Genter, B., & Steinback, S. The Economic Contribution of Marine Angler Expenditures in the United States, 2006. U.S. Department of Commerce.
Southwick Associates. (2007). Sportfishing in America: An Economic Engine and Conservation Powerhouse. Produced for the American Sportfishing Association with funding from the Multistate Conservation Grant Program.
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (2009). 2006 National Survey of Fishing, Hunting, and Wildlife-Associated Recreation.

Correspondence ID: 13982 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y

Name: private

Received: May,11,2010 15:03:36

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: I believe there can be a better balance between land use and resource conservation than what is being proposed in the DEIS. I understand the need to preserve the delicate balance of resources that make the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area so special. I also understand the importance of allowing reasonable access to these resources. I believe the underlying "facts" used as a basis for the construction of the DEIS is flawed.

I. The inclusion of the northern beaches, (Duck, Kitty Hawk, etc.) dilutes the true financial impact of the access limitations on local businesses. The actual impact on local business has been tremendous, and is seriously under-reported for purposes of the DEIS. Furthermore using 2008 data as "post consent decree" is misleading. Many people were unaware of the beach closures, and those that were already had reservations in place. 2009 should be the first year for purposes of comparing the effects of the beach closures.

II. The need for 1,000 meter buffers around nests and chicks is also excessive. Why not use suggested buffer sizes as given by the Fish & Wildlife services?

III. The restriction of leashed pets is also excessive. If dogs are such a threat (which they are not, but for arguments sake we will entertain the idea.) then simply enforcing the already present leash law would be sufficient to protect the birds and turtles. If there was a case of a domesticated pet destroying a nest or killing a bird, then the pet's owner should be held responsible. Law should not be made exponentially more restrictive to stop the irresponsible behavior of a few. Do not punish the responsible pet owners for the small minority of pet owners irresponsible actions.

IV. I disagree with the exclusion of Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge as pedestrian only land use, not including this significant piece of the seashore also skews the land use data.

The significant financial cost to the parks system as a result of the consent decree and the development of a long term plan could easily be avoided or reduced if they simply increased the amount of rangers available and on staff to actually enforce the rules. The vast majority of visitors to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area are excellent stewards of the beaches. In the twenty years I have visited Cape Hatteras, I can count on one hand the times I have seen someone act in an inappropriate or out of line way. In each of those three circumstances, the surf fishermen, who have been portrayed as "wild cowboys" were the ones to intervene. Please do not allow this beautiful and amazing resource to no longer be accessible because of the irresponsible actions of a few. If that requires charging for permits or requiring class time to be able to drive, fine. Complete closure of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area is a serious mistake, and one that I pray will never happen.

Thank you for your time and allowing me to voice my opinion, and I hope that prudent minds will be able to come to an agreement for the responsible management of one of our national treasures.

Correspondence ID: 13983 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: McCrory, John D

Received: May,11,2010 15:05:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: My wife and I own a non-rented, part-time house at Buxton, NC. We enjoy walking on the beaches in the seashore area, as do many of the guests we

have in our home. Our children and grandchildren enjoy looking for shells and other things on the beach. Presently we do not have a dog, but have had one in the past and probably will have another one; walking a dog on the beach is a great American past-time. We are not fishermen but support them in their fight to continue driving on the beach. We are keenly aware of the need for tourism to keep Hatteras Island viable. We also are aware of the animals and birds that use the beaches for breeding and food. All these things use the national seashore and its beaches and need access to the beaches. The proposed off road vehicle regulations represent an unnecessary and arbitrary attempt to close off the beaches to activities that most Americans associate with a beach. In the name of conservation, and under the sway of misguided zealots, the national seashore is going to be put out of reach of the public whom you are supposed to serve.

What is the purpose of the national seashore, if it is not to provide Americans with recreational opportunities and protection of the native birds and animals. Once the people quit coming to Hatteras because their beach experience is nothing more than looking at the water from the highway, the people move out because there is no economy to support them, the fishermen give up their fight against an unreasoning and stupidly arrogant bureaucracy and the animal zealots move on to some other place to ruin everything they touch, what then will the Park Service have accomplished?

Hatteras will be a large sand pile with nothing for anybody. The management of the Park Service can give itself plaques and praise for a great job of following on its mandate. Hopefully, there will be one or two honest employees who will wistfully remember what a great place it was before the Park Service ruined it! Of course, they can put up a nice sign that says that it used to be first national seashore of America!!

Correspondence ID: 13984 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Dorman, Roxanne D
Received: May,11,2010 15:05:26
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I very strongly support open and accessible beaches for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I do support the resource protection for the shorebirds and sea turtles when it is based on unbiased comprehensive science while still providing complete open access for human activity in the seashore. The following is a list of things that I think need to be addressed in the Management plan and are not. I am sure there is more that needs to be addressed but I do not have the ability to review an 800 page document during my limited spare time.

1. Access corridors for vehicles and pedestrians should be provided through closure area in order to gain access to areas that may be open on the other side. The corridors can be at or near the high tide line with enough space for access and use of this area.
2. The management buffers are accessive and there is not adequate science to keep them at 1000 meters. The buffers need to be based on peer reviewed science and still provide public access through these closure areas.
3. The turtle management plan could easily implement a relocation program that would provide a higher survival rate and remove the turtles from dangerous storm events. My wife worked for the NPS in Sebastian and Wabasso Florida were this was done routinely and it works.
4. This document does not adequately address the economic harm that has been caused and will continue to cause if these issues are not considered. The document states there will be "negligible to moderate" adverse impacts to the local economy. I believe this is completely inaccurate and is an insult to all the people who suffered economical throughout the outer banks community.

I know a great deal of hard work has been put into this DEIS but for the average person who has a job and family it is impossible for anyone to review and understand this information in the time that was given. If this is supposed to be for the public benefit it should be and easier process to review. In Summary there should complete open access whith managed corridors for vehicles and pedestrians during resource closures.

Correspondence ID: 13985 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Loke, Karen E
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have, however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule-making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Karen Loke 312 Copley Drive Lancaster, PA 17601

Correspondence ID: 13986 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Phillips, Glenn
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Cape Hatteras National Seashore is an important wintering area for some of the birds we work to conserve in New York. Accordingly, New York City Audubon wishes to join the comments submitted on May 11, 2010, by American Bird Conservancy, et al., in support of Alternative D with the modifications noted in that letter.

Correspondence ID: 13987 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Scarborough, Monica
Received: May,11,2010 15:06:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: So your telling me our government is willing to kill an economy over a BIRD. That is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard. So are you going to give me a job when the economy get so bad people will start loosing there jobs??? So are you going to tell my kids who have lived here their whole life they are not allowed to enjoy living at the beach because a bird is more important than the humans who live here. I am the first to tell you I love animals and treat them with the respect they deserve but I do not put them before human beings. You are crossing the line!!!!

Correspondence ID: 13988 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: N/A, N/A
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time. After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.
Maureen Salazar

Correspondence ID: 13989 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private

Received: May, 11, 2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I disagree with the assessment made by NPS that: "Visitor experience could be affected by conflicts between motorized and non-motorized recreation users." (p. vi).
I agree with the need to ask the question: Why has NPS never made public a list of reported incidents? Because ? In 10 years, only 1 minor incident involving a stuck vehicle and a pedestrian was disclosed. The driver was not blamed by those involved, nor was he charged. (p. 268)
I disagree with the statement made by NPS: Shorter Off-Season ORV access on South-facing Villages (p. xix)
I agree that the question needs to be asked: Why are Frisco, Hatteras and Ocracoke Villages closures to ORV access longer than the traditional May 15 to September 15 period, even though seasonal visitor statistics are similar for all villages? (p. 23)
I agree with the statement by NPS: "Carrying capacity would be a 'peak use limit' determined for all areas based on the linear feet of beachfront?" (p. xxiv)
But I also agree then the question needs to be asked: Why is capacity more restrictive on Bodie Island and Ocracoke than at Cape Point? (p. xxiv). (Bodie Island & Ocracoke -260 vehicles per mile and Cape Point ?400 vehicles per mile). This seems to be in conflict with the earlier assessment made by NPS regarding "Carrying Capacity". I also agree that the question needs to be asked of the NPS: Why do ORV counts provided for Memorial Day and July 4, 2009 which state: "ramp 4: includes Bodie Island Spit" and "ramp 43 to ramp 49: includes Cape Point" fail to recognize Bodie Island Spit and Cape Point were closed to ORV access on these dates due to resource protection closures, which thereby increased ORV congestion at ramps 4, 43, 44, and 49? (p. 265)
I disagree with the assessment by NPS: "Because it is not administered by the NPS, the seashore cannot direct the visitor use at Pea Island NWR." (p. 1)
I agree with asking the question: Why does NPS refuse to acknowledge that Pea Island is a prime, pedestrian-only area for visitors to the seashore and overstate the need for more ORV free areas? By eliminating this vast stretch of beach which is already off limits to ORV access it makes the beach parcels they intend on closing look like a smaller percentage of the overall resource area under closure to ORV.
I agree with the DEIS descriptions of ORV access as historical in nature (pg. 83) and also both predating the Seashore and as being integral to the public use by both residents and visitors. The document also illustrates and captions historical commercial fishing (pg.18), historical recreational fishing (pgs. 15, 260) and historical general recreational activities (pg. 259). These same traditional cultural activities are featured on the front cover.
I disagree with the NPS failure to appropriately address the traditional cultural value of surf zone access. I disagree because the NPS failure stands in direct violation of its legal responsibility under Section 106 of the NEPA and the NEPA framework as a whole. Isn't it ironic that the DEIS has a collage of pictures on the very first depicting surf fishing and ORV usage, but all this 810 page document does is limit the access based on false science.
I disagree with the NPS definition that Large, Inflexible Buffers be used, (p. 121-127) because they are too large, too restrictive and do not allow for ORV pass-thru only corridors
I agree with the opinion that:
? buffers use breeding / nesting buffer distances to establish ORV pass through only corridors to ensure beach access is always maintained
? Piping Plover unfledged chicks buffer should move with the brood as it relocates to reliable food source, not expanded
I disagree with the overall assessment made by NPS Resource Management Pedestrian / ORV Closure Policies Address because the Least Significant Factor Affecting Nest Survival with Little Chance to have more than Negligible Impact, AMOY Nest Failures are predominately due to Non-human Events. ?for example:
? Mammalian Predation: 54% Highest Impact ? Storm / Lunar Tides: 29% ? Nest Abandonment: 6% ? Avian Predation: 5% ? Ghost Crab Predation: 3%
? Human Interference: 3% Insignificant Impact
I disagree with how NPS does not adequately consider locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem. They did not consider:
? Villages, dredge and spoil islands, Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge
? Dredge and spoil islands typically have fewer predators to threaten nesting birds
? Bird activity within neighboring areas should be tracked and included in target productivity levels. Fluctuations and trends in Recreational Area bird populations should be viewed relative to regional and state experiences ?not in isolation.
I agree that all locations neighboring the Recreational Area that are part of the same ecosystem and should have been considered.
I disagree with the NPS: Around the clock closure from nest to surf line (p.125) from May 1 ?November 15th. If the area is closed around the clock from the nest to the surf line, it cuts off all access. Closing all the way to surf line blocks access to the entire beach. It would be better managed if the access were allowed to pass below the nest near the surf.
I agree with a Closure to surf line from 1 hour before sunset until dawn, monitored by Turtle Night Nest Watch Team because the proposed Night Driving Restrictions Penalize Pedestrian and ORV users. Education and awareness are the most beneficial to all parties involved. Simply eliminating access is not "managing" the resource. And the resource is supposed to be available to all parties.
I disagree with the NPS barriers 105 meters wide (p.125) this cuts off all access and one nest at the beginning of two consecutive ramps would block the entire section of beach between the two ramps. This does not take into account all of the beach between two different nests that are cut off completely because the blockage is all the way to the surf line leaving zero passage. I agree with the statement that "Closure should be 10 meters square during the day" This is a more effective way to allow for access. The plan should cover off-road vehicle access, not total off-road vehicle elimination. Eliminating access is not "managing" it.
I disagree with the Prohibition of PETS in the seashore during bird breeding season, including in front of the villages."(p136)= No pets in public areas-beaches, campgrounds, sound-front, foot trails, park maintained roads from March 15 -July 31.
It is perfectly acceptable to have dogs tethered utilizing the six foot leash rule.
I disagree with the NPS position: "Even with resource closures in place, protected species are still at risk [from pedestrians and ORVs]." (p. 210)
I agree with facts related to current ORV access that:
? No Piping Plover deaths have been attributed to ORVs.
? ORV violations continue to decrease as signage and education improve.
? Pedestrian violations are much more significant than ORV violations.
I also agree that the question needs to be asked of the NPS: Why are buffers and closures administered such that more people are forced into smaller areas, potentially resulting in more resource impairment and diminished visitor experience?
I disagree with the socioeconomic data and analyses in the DEIS (pg 270-281;561-598) because it results in misleading and sometimes erroneous conclusions and is directly manifested in both the Effectuated Environment and Socioeconomic Impact sections. Critical weaknesses in the analyses pertain to:
1) Statistical definition of the Region of Influence (ROI); 2) Incomplete visitation/business survey data (p.566); 3) Erroneous recreational user data; 4) inflated overall Seashore visitor counts pertaining to beach use; 5) Flawed key assumption concerning the maintenance of access under Alternative The definition that ROI incorporation of the Northern Beach communities, including Southern Shores and Duck is misleading. These areas are almost completely disconnected from ORV use and access issues relating to the Seashore
The inclusion of the Northern Beaches in analysis significantly dilutes estimates of economic impact on the Seashore Villages.
The analysis of economic impact to the Seashore Villages appears to be significantly down played. Emphasis in DEIS is on the ROI-wide or county-wide level impacts.
Nowhere is it clearly addressed that the overwhelming majority of negative impacts will be felt by small businesses in the Seashore Villages rather than by overall economic impacts within the greater ROI.
Why is it OK to include all of these extraneous areas when it comes to Region of Influence (ROI); but NOT ok to include the populations of birds that exist on the dredge islands?
.
I disagree with the NPS: Use U shaped light filter fence to orient hatchlings
I agree with a proposed "Use Pea Island style keyhole pattern fence to the surf line at night".

I disagree with NPS that : "ORV and other recreational use would have long-term major adverse impacts on sea turtles due to the amount of Seashore available for ORV use and by allowing nighttime driving on the beach." (p. 377)

I agree with the assessment that "Major Adverse" (NPS definition, p.369) events have not occurred at the Recreational Area ?Night Driving Restrictions are not Necessary because: ? Nesting females have not "been killed"
 ? Complete or partial nest lost due to human activity has not "occurred frequently"
 ? This is all conjecture on the part of NPS. There is no documented evidence to support their accusations. They are merely speculating on a worst case scenario. Education and awareness are the best tools for the job here. An educated informed public addresses the true spirit of "managed" resource as opposed to total elimination of beach access, which requires no "management". ? Hatchling disorientation/disruption due to humans have not "occurred frequently" ? Direct hatchling mortality from human activity has not "frequently occurred" ? Pro-active Turtle Night Nest Watch program will insure no ORV impact.

I disagree with the position that NPS will not Adopt More Proactive Techniques Used at Other East Coast Locations to Encourage Turtle Nesting Success.

I agree with the assessment that NPS Inadequately Addresses Environmental Issues More Detrimental to Turtle Recovery Success than ORVs or Pedestrians (p. 392-396) because:
 ? 38.5% of nests had 0% hatchlings due to weather events. (p. 87, p. 219) ? 2009 Loggerhead Recovery Plan calls this catastrophic
 ? False crawl statistics do not support theory that light pollution is a significant problem at the Recreational Area. (p.125, p. 219)
 ? Predator management and nest enclosure practices encourage ghost crabs which are a primary predator of turtle eggs and hatchlings

I disagree with NPS usage of The North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission Relocation Guidelines.
 I agree with an assessment that the North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission Relocation Guidelines are Inadequate because:
 ? Recreational Area and the State have lost 55% and 60% of Leatherback nests respectively over the past 10 years following these guidelines.
 ? Use of "average high tide line" (as used in other states) rather than "seaward of debris line marking spring high tide" to identify which nests to relocate leave many nests at risk.

I disagree with the management decisions reflected in the DEIS that show a clear bias to implement actions that will adversely affect the visitor experience but to avoid actions that would benefit both natural resources and visitors. For instance:
 ? The NPS says it is OK to replace South Point wetlands with parking area because beach will be closed to ORVs.
 ? The NPS says it is OK to relocate Turtle Nests when storms are imminent, but not before (coincidentally the high risk nests are in prime ORV corridors).
 ? The NPS says it is OK to set aside areas of beach to replant the "extirpated" seabeach amaranth, but not OK to clear vegetation at Cape Point ponds to create more favorable piping plover habitat (outside of the prime ORV corridor).
 ? The NPS says it is OK to kill predators (greatest risk to birds and turtles), not OK to drive on the beach at night (deterrent to predators, low risk to turtles and birds).

I disagree with the NPS assessment of Restrictive Species Management Areas (p. 468) Where they state:
 NPS: Established based on annual habitat assessment. NPS: Manage each SMA using ML1 or ML2 procedures. NPS: ML1 ?No pedestrian or ORV access during entire breeding season NPS: ML2 ?pedestrian only corridor thru SMA at Bodie Island Spit NPS: ML2 -pedestrian & ORV corridor thru SMA at Cape Point, South Point

I agree with the opinion that: ML1 is overly restrictive. Pedestrian and ORV corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding & nesting season (within guidelines) to maintain access.

I disagree with the NPS assessment of Limited Pedestrian and ORV Corridors (p. 468) because:
 NPS: Only recognized in ML2 managed SMAs NPS: SMA management reverts to standard buffers when bird breeding activity first observed

I agree with the opinion that:: Pedestrian and ORV corridors or bypasses should be provided thru, around or below high tide line in all SMAs during entire breeding season to maintain access.

In conclusion:
 I disagree with the NPA proposed Alternative F restrictions because they far exceed those under the Consent Decree, the Interim Management Strategy, and the de facto ORV plan previously in place under Superintendent's Order #7.
 I disagree with the speakers at the public hearings being limited to three minutes to address an 810 page document!!!
 Supposedly the Park Service has budget issues. Have they published the cost of doing this do called impact? I disagree with this 810 page document even being called the DEIS. Since when did it become DEIS? It's supposed to be an off-road vehicle management plan. The title includes Cape Hatteras National Seashore and it includes the word off-road vehicle management plan. So why is it referred to as D(draft) EIS. Why isn't it referred to as CHNSORVMPEIS?

Correspondence ID: 13990 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Lamperti, Deborah M
Received: May,11,2010 15:08:53
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Dear Sir or madam:
 I oppose the restriction of OVR on the Cape Hatteras National Sea shore. I have been fishing in Buxton NC since 1990 and I have not witnessed any destruction of Habitat for the Piping Plover or Sea turtles by OVR use.
 What I do see is that there are not enough Park rangers available to ticket or fine violators of the current rules.
 Also, the Piping Plover and Sea turtles nest up and down the Atlantic Seaboard so why target one area that is critical to the livelihood of the residents and visitors. Can you tell me the number of nest damage by OVR versus predators? I have heard that there is more destruction of nest due to predators which would normally be deterred by Human presence.
 Debbie Lamperti

Correspondence ID: 13991 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 15:10:16
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Please do not approve the ORV plan for Cape Hatteras but instead adopt the modified Alternative D of the draft Environmental Impact Statement. I have been going to Cape Hatteras since I was a baby- for 32 years now! and I love the beauty and natural surroundings that I am in everytime I go. If you allow vehicles, it will discolor the sand, endanger animals and plants and make it a much different experience for us beach lovers. Please don't allow this!!!

Correspondence ID: 13992 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Sanchez, Rachel M
Received: May,11,2010 15:12:35
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I really appreciate the beauty of Hatteras Island, and I am grateful for the parts that are preserved and protected by the National Park Service, but I do believe the access restrictions are way overboard in this proposal, and I am very concerned that it will go through as published. We are in charge of taking care of this planet, but I also know that we should have the privilege of enjoying it. We must find a balance where we can both protect and enjoy this beautiful place. That balance has not been found in these access restrictions, and I am certainly opposed.

Correspondence ID: 13993 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: Swartz, Neil
Received: May,11,2010 15:12:39
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: I think the Alternative F plan for CHNSRA is way too restrictive and would do much more harm than good if implemented as written.
Thank You, Neil Swartz

Correspondence ID: 13994 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: ELLISON, BRIAN
Received: May,11,2010 15:12:45
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: To whom this may concern,
I grew up in Hatteras Village from the time I was 10 years old. Before I ever lived in Hatteras full-time, I was a visitor for years. I have memories and recollections on the beaches of Hatteras that I will cherish for the rest of my life. Without access to the beaches in off-road vehicles, I may have never made these happy memories.
My mother married a native of Hatteras Village in 1991. So when we relocated to Hatteras from Northern Virginia, I knew what a special place it really is. My dad showed me how to cast a line into the surf, launch boats, and how to drive a stick shift... all on the beach over Ramp #55 in Hatteras. Without a doubt, the access enjoyed by everyone shaped me as a child and as a developing young man.
Who knows what would have taken the place of beach rides and sunsets in those highschool years. Maybe I would have used my time in less favorable activities. Activities that would be harmful to the community and possibly to myself.
So what is more important? Closing beaches or keeping the societal community true to the standards we all know and love?
Not to mention the tourism driven by our access to the beaches. I don't need to elaborate on that point. My family ran a motel when I was growing up, so we depended on tourism as many many families do today.
Keep the beaches open!
Sincerely, Brian Ellison, Pharm.D. UNC School of Pharmacy Class of 2004

Correspondence ID: 13995 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596 **Private:** Y
Name: private
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Leave the beaches open. As someone who has been visiting Hatteras two to three times a year since 1969, I have come to love the island the people the fishing even the birds. All can coexist, to remove the people from the beaches is to destroy the economy, the local businesses, the fishing, the way of life and the very essence of the island. People have been a part of the life of the island...do not make us humans an endangered animal!

Correspondence ID: 13996 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596
Name: MIDGETT, THEODORE S
Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00
Correspondence Type: Web Form
Correspondence: Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954
Dear Superintendent Murray,
I am writing you today to make formal comments on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan Draft Environmental Impact Statement, specifically Alternative F, created by the National Park Service with input from the negotiated rulemaking advisory Committee. I wish to thank the National Park Service for an opportunity to comment on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore ORV Management Plan DEIS. As a concerned Hatteras Island citizen and president of Midgett Brothers Inc. I feel it is my professional and civic duty to make timely comment on a matter that affects millions of citizens who wish to visit and have access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.
When the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area was formed, the National Park Service stressed to the local residents in 1949 that this park would be an economic asset to the villages located within the park's boundaries. In 1952, Park Superintendent Conrad Wirth wrote that the park and its staff would "bring enjoyment to millions of visitors and prosperity to you."
We, the native people of the islands were asked by the government to be the host to the nation and the world at the seashore. Our family, the Midgett's, responded to that call from our government. My father and Uncles began the famous Hatteras Island - Manteo Bus Line, which carried islanders and visitors up and down the beach in the days before roads and bridges. The family business has grown throughout the years such that we now own the largest natively owned vacation rental company on the island, a motel, a real estate and constructions business, two marinas and a restaurant. Now, because we responded to that call of duty, we are in jeopardy of losing all we have worked for?.for ourselves and future generations?.being put in jeopardy by the very same entity that called us to duty.
Economic Impact:
The Economic Impact Analysis found the DEIS by its own admission is incomplete. How can we comment on an incomplete document? The Economic analysis is structured in such a manner that it fails to address full costs?direct costs, indirect costs, lost opportunity costs, costs of future liability, and hidden costs.
Not only does the analysis not adequately convey the economic impact of the proposed Alternative F, it fails to address any of the alternatives listed in the DEIS. The data is incomplete, misleading and the statements of what are supposed to be facts are without sound basis. The area is unique because it is removed from any large populations and has limited transportation infrastructure. These two points translate into a very high cost of living which gained no mention in the DEIS.
The Economic Analysis fails to recognize that the national seashore environment is a unique form of capital that serves the local economy, and in turn the health and well being of citizens and families that depend of that economy. Access to the seashore is essential for family business operations on the Outer Banks. In our family business, vacation rentals, the spring rental season has been decimated by the beach closures brought about by the consent decree. The demographics of the spring guests have been traditionally fishermen and they are unwilling to risk sending money on a vacation when the beach access is so untenable.
The DEIS suggests "F" will have revenue impacts on small businesses "at the low end of the estimated range rather than the high end." Make no mistake! Tourists are THE lifeblood of the local economy. They stay at motels and rental houses. They eat at the restaurants and buy food from the grocery stores. They put gas in their vehicles. They support the local shops by getting bait and tackle, bathing suits, surf boards and books. They buy souvenirs, local art and T-Shirts to remember their time here on the islands. During the summer, it was difficult to find a place to stay if you didn't have a reservation and there were always long waits to get into restaurants. For decades, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area was immune from recession including the fallout from Sept. 11, 2001. Economic downturns that would cripple the national economy tended to give a boost to the Hatteras economy because people were inclined to go to Hatteras for inexpensive, short-distance vacations.
The Consent Decree has taken a heavy toll on the local economy. Without sensible beach access, there is no reason for tourists to come here. Since 2008, successful businesses that are older than the park itself have started to fail.
The Consent Decree and the resulting soft economy happened months before the nation began suffering from the recession. When the stock market plunged in September 2008, the Hatteras and Ocracoke economies were rebounding because the beaches reopened the month before. Businesses located near closed ramps to the beach struggled while businesses near an open ramp blossomed, even if they were just a few miles apart. Previous bird protection plans, specifically the Interim Protected Species Management Plan, had no effect on the local business.
It is my understanding that the Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce, on behalf of its more than 1,000 members with businesses in Dare, Hyde and

Currituck counties, has gone on record as vehemently disagreeing with the validity of the economic impact analysis included in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for proposed new rules for access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

This group of professional business owners states unequivocally states "Not only does the analysis not adequately convey the economic impact of the proposed Alternative F, it fails to address any of the alternatives listed in the DEIS. The data is incomplete, misleading and the statements of what are supposed to be facts are without sound basis."

Hatteras Inlet Permanent Closure:

If I understand the document correctly, it would appear as if the DEIS proposes to close the beaches at Hatteras Inlet, both the South Tip of Hatteras Island and the North tip of Ocracoke Island permanently and year-round.

To allow this closure of the inlet to occur could very well be devastating to the economy of Hatteras Village. Businesses in the Village have still not recovered from the many effects of Hurricane "Isabel" in 2003. Many of us are still carrying substantial SBA loans from that event.

Aside from the fact that such a closure would forever alter the traditional uses of these areas, such a closure has already and will impact the public safety of mariners traversing the inlet.

On Saturday, May 1st 2010, a local inshore charter boat from Hatteras Village overturned in Hatteras Inlet. There were 6 occupants of the boat, all family members, 3 children and 3 adults. The captain was a professional charter captain. They spent 4 hours in the water awaiting rescue. They could have been seen from the beach, had it been open but instead had to wait until the offshore charter fleet was returning in late day for any hopes of being rescued. One of the group died as a result. The family in question is my neighbor and a valued employee.

Unreasonable amount of areas reserved for nesting closures:

A 1,000-meter buffer in all directions of an unfledged piping plover chick represents 771 acres of closed beach! I have yet to read any scientific reasoning behind this management strategy. It is my understanding that in Assateague Island National Seashore the buffer is 300 meters. Why is the 1,000 meter buffer being proposed for CHNSRA? Why is one National Seashore being treated so differently than others when we are at the extreme southernmost extremity of the nesting area? A much smaller buffer would be just as effective for the survival of a piping plover chick without the extreme penalization of the residents and visitors of Hatteras Island.

Pet Restrictions:

It appears as if the preferred alternative prohibits pets in the Seashore during bird breeding season including in front of the villages. This means no pets in public areas ?beaches, campgrounds, sound front, foot trails, and park maintained roads from March 15 ?July 31. If this is a correct interpretation, I am opposed. I support the previous leash law (all pets must be on a leash 6 feet or less in length).

In closing, I am not only a business owner, but a father. I have 5 sons who all live on Hatteras Island and who are working as productive Island citizens. Our businesses are totally reliable on the tourism industry. Given the recent closures of the island beaches due to the ongoing "plans" put forth by the Park Service, or lack thereof, our business has suffered considerable losses of revenue in every area; especially during the much needed "off-seasons" when beach closures are at the peak. What type of legacy will they inherit?

I have a vested interest in protecting the future of Hatteras Island as a whole; our property, our family, our friends?.the people who live here, access to the seashore and the beaches, the natural surroundings, wildlife, sea life, and all that makes this island special.

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with any of the six alternatives within the document. I have, however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources. I believe that a reasonable and realistic approach into the management of CHNSRA will allow adequate protection of wildlife while maintaining a balance and necessary access to our beaches and seashore. As residents we are hosts of this beautiful island and welcome visitors. It has been my belief and experience that together we all share an interest and an obligation in preserving and protecting access to this land and the seashore for our families now. In turn, generations to come will be able to enjoy all that the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area has to offer, both now and in the future.

Sincerely, Ted Midgett, Hatteras, NC

Correspondence ID: 13997 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Muller, James J

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: Mr. Mike Murray, Superintendent
Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area
1401 National Park Drive
Manteo, NC 27954

Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

After reviewing the National Park Service DEIS I must disagree with the alternatives within the document. I have; however, reviewed the 77 page Coalition for Beach Access Position Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far succeeds in furnishing the best visitor experience while maintaining the needs of protecting the fragile resources.

Please consider all aspects of this alternative and put people back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We have always been respectful of the wildlife and it is one of the reasons we live here. However, we fell law abiding citizens should have access to the beaches also.

Thank you,

James Muller & Kris Wilson

54053 Tides Edge Lane

Frisco, NC 27936

Correspondence ID: 13998 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Briggs, Mitch L

Received: May,11,2010 15:16:03

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: To whom it may concern:

With the exception of one year, my family and I have been making annual visits to Buxton, NC since 1961. We have been camping at Cape Point campground all these years and have enjoyed surf fishing from The Point to Hatteras Inlet and on Ocracoke as well. We are now planning this year's trip with our fourth generation in tow. It has always been our experience that fishermen and other recreational beach-goers have the utmost respect for the beaches we love, and the wildlife therein. We sincerely wish to continue having access to our beautiful salty piece of land known as Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I know you have seen all the arguments by now. It is my hope that after weighing all the studies and opinions you will do the right thing for the people who actually visit and live on the OBX, and keep our beaches open. Please do this for the next four generations and beyond.

Kind regards, Mitch

Correspondence ID: 13999 **Project:** 10641 **Document:** 32596

Name: Kooyman, Linda

Received: May,11,2010 00:00:00

Correspondence Type: Web Form

Correspondence: May 10, 2010

Mike Murray, Superintendent Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area 1401 National Park Drive Manteo, NC 27954

Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please accept this letter as my comment on the ORV DEIS before you at this time.

After reviewing the National Park Service 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 part of the negotiated rule making process and it by far exceeds in furnishing 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.

Thank you for your consideration.

Linda and Marty Kooyman 27456 Oakcrest Drive Brownstown, MI 48183

Property owners at: 50165 Treasurer Court Frisco, NC

Correspondence ID:	14000	Project:	10641	Document:	32596
Name:	Pedersen, Edward				
Received:	May,11,2010 00:00:00				
Correspondence Type:	Web Form				
Correspondence:	Hello, Please accept this letter as my comments on the ORV DEIS. After reviewing the NPS DEIS I must disagree with the six alternatives within the document. The DEIS management alternatives have little to do with developing a responsible off road vehicle management plan. The alternatives map out a plan to exclude humans from the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area. This document is way off base. A 1000 meter buffer zone for common shore bird nests ia absolutely absurd. This buffer zone allows a bird nest a circle that cannot be entered by humans that is over a mile across! We do not afford this type of easment to any other animal. It makes no sense whatsoever to place such a buffer zone around the nests of oyster catchers and terns let alone the misguided plovers that are attempting to nest outside of their natural range. Another thing that really bothers me is the way the National Park Service is slaughtering mamalian wildlife under the guise of protecting endangered birds. THE BIRDS ARE NOT ENDANGERED! The fact that the park service is deciding which wildlife can live and which species should be irradiated ...not right! I have reviewed the Coalition for Beach Access Statement signed by several groups that were a part of the negotiated rule making process (another travesty), 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 actual people, not lawyers, back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.				
