

**Correspondence ID:** 12000    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12001    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12002    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12003    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12004    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12005    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12006    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12007    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It is of the importance to start to protect our shorelines and natural environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12008    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12009    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12010    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** While I am a firm believer in free access for people to all beaches in the U.S., I am against the use of ATV's. This is not necessary transportation for individuals, it is just for the amusement of a small minority of beach users. It is harmful to wildlife habitats for plants, grasses in particular, and animals alike. I would like to see all use of such vehicles prohibited except for park and police emergency use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12011    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the chance to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The current management plan at the Seashore has been a great success, and sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation will change that as it treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12012    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** ATV'S should not be allowed in fragile wilderness areas, nor should they be permitted off the designated roadways. These people are out to have fun on their vehicles...not take in the wonder that is so special about these delicate environments, nor do they care what they kill or destroy in their quest for speed and thrills. I have no problem with ATV'ers...only where they enjoy

their sport. They don't need to speed the extinction of protected species in their quest for speed and thrills.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12013    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Roads are for driving, beaches are for shorebirds. Keep your (our) vehicles off our beaches!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12014    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** NO off-road vehicles should be allowed on any beach or sea shore that belongs to the people, especially ones filled w/ wildlife such as Cape Hatteras. This is a no-brainer, for goodness sakes!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12015    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12016    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12017    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12018    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** With the advent of increased logging, oil and gas drilling and other sustained assaults by development on our wild areas, it is time to consider what we can do to minimize and eliminate addition stress and impact on our wild life and wild lands.

As a former NASA contractor employee, I have traveled and enjoyed to many beautiful areas in this country including the Outer Banks of north Carolina where I enjoy camping and kayaking. In all the many years I have traveled there, I have never had or felt the need to impose upon the beaches and especially Hatteras' dunes where myriad of sea birds and other wildlife depend on its' protection for crucial habitat.

Please do not allow unrestricted ORV use on these beaches. ORV users need to understand the critical nature of these very sensitive areas. We all need to take more - not less responsibility when it comes to protecting our environment.

Humans have enough.

How much must we take from these struggling and in some cases endangered creatures before we realize, we have taken it not only from them but from ourselves?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12019    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12020    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12021    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12022    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12023    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.

I oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife.

Yet the proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

Please consider regulations to protect our endangered shorebirds & sea turtles as well as their nesting areas.

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12024    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12025    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Cape Hatteras and the wildlife that depend on it for their survival are national treasures and we are losing them little by little every day. Every single individual creature that perishes due to disturbance and habitat loss makes it more difficult for that species to survive. We owe it all the future Americans to preserve these with every instrument we can enact. My family and I have vacationed there and in the immediate area and are heartbroken every time we see a vehicle on the beach. It is completely

unfair to all of humanity to allow it to continue.

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. Very sincerely, James Dugan New Milford, CT

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12026    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12027    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12028    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Please don't let off-road vehicles damage our beautiful coastal areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12029    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape

Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12030	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31.2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12031	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31.2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.						

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes an

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12032	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31.2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such



as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12033    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12034    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12035    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Now we have witnessed yet again the destruction of hurricane Irene to the fragility of our state's barrier islands. I believe the everyday use of all types of motor vehicles will wear on these lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12036    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The Cape Hatteras Sea Shore is to preserve nature. ORVs are not part of nature.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12037    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses. Frankly, there should be no driving of any vehicles on a beach where there will be children as there will also be accidents and children being hurt besides the birds and animals. As a rule, people do not act responsibly. Driving is for roads and not beaches, beaches are for walking and you cannot enjoy yourself if you have to watch out for speeding dune buggies etc and birds will be stressed and some run over and killed. Please act responsibly and build a nearby track for racing around in a dune buggy or off road vehicle. They do

not belong on any beach. A refuge is a safe haven for birds and animals. Lets keep it that way please.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12038    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12039    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please consider protection of nesting areas fro shore birds as you develop your plan for vehicle use on shore lines.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12040    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12041    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I enjoy wildlife viewing and the peace and serenity of our national parks. I do not want to see that destroyed by ORVs.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12042    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12043    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12044    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I have been visiting the OBX since 1968. I am both an avid birdwatcher and a professional fishing guide (in Michigan). While I enjoy driving on the beach to gain access to fishing locations, especially the Cape Point and South Point, I realize that protecting nesting species which are threatened or endangered is a good thing, also.

I think that by pissing off both groups of users--ORV'ers, birders, and anglers, you are probably on target. Make sure that there are no happy folks with the proposed rules.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12045    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12046    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. Please institute these regulations to protect our extremely valuable, and extremely vulnerable, wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12047    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12048    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12049    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12050    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Driving on the beach is not a necessity. Survival of Earth's creatures is.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12051    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12052    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Under the current management plan at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that proposed changes treat wildlife protection as optional, provide few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan could also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12053    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12054    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12055	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31.2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12056	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31.2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

I cannot emphasize how important an issue this is and how much I, along with many other people, care! Please ensure that the gains made won't be lost.

Respectfully,

Mrs. Linda Gilbert

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12057	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31.2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. We must make every effort to save these gems for future generations.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12058	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12059	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

I

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12060	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12061    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12062    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

In the name of recreation the work of conservation is being undone...consumed by recreationists who feel like they can go anywhere and do anything they like...mountain bikes, horses and horse keeping in riparian areas, steep slopes and not practicing pastrue rotation, kayakers disturbing wintering water birds and harbor seals, dog walkers...There is a lack of understanding concerning appropriate uses in open space, State, County and national parks and areas set aside specifically for recreation.

Dune buggies are not a compatible use in breeding and wintering areas for sensitive willlife, listed or not.

Don't yield. Do not allow this desecration of our natural resources for the entertainment of thrill seekers. Let them use old quarry sites or other ruined land.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12063    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Special Regulations, Areas of National Park System: Cape Hatteras National Seashore (Document ID NPS-2011-0005-0001)

National Park Service

To whom iit may concern, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Karen L Romano

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12064    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y



**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Naomi C Marquardt

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12065	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	+v						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12066	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12067	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I support protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12068	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12069    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12070    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** please save our earth and it's living creatures!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12071    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** all areas of our national park system, like Cape Hatteras National Seashore, must be preserved! they are precious to the balance of our ecosystem here on earth!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12072    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12073    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I wish to take this opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing off-road vehicle (ORV) use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a stunning comeback. I am concerned that the proposed new regulation threatens wildlife and safe recreation for families while prioritizing the shallow and irresponsible desires of ORV users. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will protect the species that depend on the Seashore only if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12074    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife.

**Correspondence ID:** 12075      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12076      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

**Correspondence ID:** 12077      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** please stop killing turtles.

**Correspondence ID:** 12078      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

**Correspondence ID:** 12079      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12080    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Two years ago, I moved to the area near Savannah, Georgia and Tybee Island. I have been very impressed with the effort many people put forth to protect sea turtles, their nests, and their habitat. Unfortunately, I have also seen how easy it is for human activity to have seriously adverse effects on these magnificent sea creatures. Please do everything you can to protect them.

**Correspondence ID:** 12081    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 12082    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** NO motorized vehicles...how dare we take up more and more space for our comfort and convenience and make money off the land which does belong to animal's too and are used for bird's breeding grounds.

**Correspondence ID:** 12083    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12084    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12085	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12086	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12087	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

**Correspondence:** As someone who grew up in Carteret County, North Carolina, and visited the unspoiled Outer Banks in the 1950's and 1960's before the large scale degradation of the environment that has occurred during my lifetime, I really want to speak out.

I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made

a tremendous comeback.

There is, in my opinion, no inherent right for people to drive off road vehicles on beaches, no matter how thrilling the experience might be. I understand the appeal, as when I was an unwise youth (though we didn't have ORV's) driving on the beach in cars was a dangerous thrill.

I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. I implore you to add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12088	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please take a closer look at your proposed plan to manage ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

Thank you for your time and consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12089	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please take my comment about protections for Cape Hatteras and Outer Banks, NC.						

When I was growing up in MD, my family tent-camped on Cape Hatteras. I wasn't as environmentally aware then, as I am now, and hope that we didn't disturb the wildlife.

Please place severe and rigid restrictions on ATV and other vehicles on the beaches. They are terribly noisy and about as destructive to the sand and nests as anything could be.

Irene has left her mark on this area and it will need time and help to recover. The wildlife comes first.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12090	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12091    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12092    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12093    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12094    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Protection of wildlife IS NOT AN OPTION, it is NECESSARY!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12095    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles have no place on National Seashores, especially at Cape Hatteras. They destroy nests and lead to erosion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12096    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12097    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12098    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12099    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.



The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12100    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please save our wildlife. Please take necessary actions to take care of the birds and turtles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12101    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please make sufficient areas of Cape Hatteras National Seashore offlimits to vehicles to protect and maintain healthy wildlife populations. The national seashore belongs to all of us, not just ORV fans. Many people do not feel comfortable going into places that are heavily traveled by ORVs.

More importantly, wildlife has a right to live in areas where they have historically found their homes, and the National Park Service has a responsibility to support and enforce specific, enforceable and science-based protections for wildlife within its purview.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12102    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As an American citizen & a tourist of many sights in this great nation, I would like to say that I am outraged that ORV are permitted on the Cape Hatteras beach shore. They are a danger to see turtles & nesting birds. Please put a stop to this at once!

Naomi C Marquardt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12103    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I have always been appalled that anyone would ever be allowed to drive on any beach. Then I reluctantly accepted that vehicles might be allowed in some non-sensitive areas. Now it seems that the proposed rules will make it even easier to drive almost anywhere on the beach, wild life be damned. I strongly oppose such legislation. We need to move in the opposite direction. Who are these lazy people that can't park on this side of the dunes and walk to the beach? It makes me ashamed of my own kind.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12104    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

The proposed rule references minimizing harassment of wildlife and the resources on public lands, and minimizing significant disruption of wildlife habitats. I would urge that instead of "minimizing" the rule would "eliminate" any harassment and disruption of wildlife and habitats.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses. As a supporter of our country's national parks AND the environment, I urge you to protect both.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12105    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12106    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. As a resident of Volusia County, Florida, it is always sad to see nesting and resting birds being chased into flight by cars, ORVs, and motorcycles on our beaches. Then, you go to the Canaveral National Seashore and the beaches are so pristine and natural--no cars, no ORVs, just a beautiful, natural beach landscape for humans and animals to enjoy.

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Margaret DeVane

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12107    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12108    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12109    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12110    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12111    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.

I oppose and I urge you to oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife.

The proposed regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore do little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-

round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over.

There has been great progress in important protections for Hatteras' wildlife, and we can't lose traction now. ORV advocates want the entire seashore open to beach driving. I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12112	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am so saddened by going to the beach and see the off-road culture pollute and deficate on the beaches that I grew up on. I do not want to take my children to this environment, or lack there of. Please stop allowing our earth to be poisoned by imbisils.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12113	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12114	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12115	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12116    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12117    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12118    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a

natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12119    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12120    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not permit off-road vehicles on Cape Hatteras so the survival of many birds may continue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12121    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am writing because of my concern over the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan currently sets aside only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use, with much more open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12122    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire

area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you for taking my comments into consideration

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12123    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Protect nesting birds and turtles. do not allow unrestricted ORV use in the National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12124    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thanks for taking comments on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and shrinking populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Thank you for considering these comments and for the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12125    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thanks for taking comments on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and shrinking populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Thank you for considering these comments and for the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12126    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12127    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Until the last tree is cut, the last animal hunted, the last river poisoned, the last fish caught. Will you then realize that money can not be eaten. This was said by the Cree Native Americans. I use it because I watch this where I live. We have a lake that feeds our wildlife. But it is poisoned the trees were cut and poisoned by black top too. 900 pounds of fish were dead and floating & were brought out . I am taping the cutting of eagles nest and not even those who are paid to protect will do so. I am hoping that soon mankind will stop. I urge you to do something I promise the american people will not be happy when they have time to miss the wildlife we use know because they will be gone. But I personally have been changed my views on America. I'm not proud I am not going to do anything the same. I see it cares for what will not save them from sure destruction. Do you care?

**Correspondence ID:** 12128    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Please show the appropriate concern that these birds and animals deserve. They are a crucial part of keeping New England beautiful.

**Correspondence ID:** 12129    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed. Please outlaw recreational vehicles from the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 12130    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. Our family loves the beach, both here and in Florida where we lived. Sharing the beach with the birds and turtles is one of life's pleasures that we don't wish to give up, ever.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12131    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,



I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12132    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It is mandated by law that these parks are supposed to be watched over. You deliberately throw the word "optional" in because of what you think is rational. Those who know about the policies a lot better would tell you to think this straight through and what you are doing is irrational.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12133    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Bill Brown

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12134    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

PLEASE, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12135	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12136	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.						

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12137	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12138	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						

**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Motorized vehicles should not be allowed in sensitive environments such as Cape Hatteras. They are destructive to wildlife, cause erosion, and are annoying to every other person in sight, earshot, or smelling range of them.

**Correspondence ID:** 12139    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12140    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Prohibit or severely limit ATVs and ORVs.

**Correspondence ID:** 12141    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12142    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I support more vehicle free areas for the protection of wildlife whether its nesting Kemp's Ridley sea turtles on the coast of texas or nesting snowy plovers in Oregon, etc.

**Correspondence ID:** 12143    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. I don't feel that it is necessary to continue to plow over wildlife areas. Haven't we done enough damage as it is? When is this going to stop? Why is wildlife so less important and only when they are endangered does anyone seem to think

about caring?

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12144    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12145    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12146    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I love birds and animals of all kinds.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12147    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12148    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please stop unrestricted offroad vehicle use. All wildlife is important and should be respected and protected from unnecessary harm. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12149    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do all you can for wildlife.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12150    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I think that the government should restrict part of Cape Hatteras just for wildlife and not allow swimming in those areas. Divers can use other parts of the Island for their pleasure. We need to share the earth with plants and animals not try to take it all to humans desires.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12151    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12152    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect wildlife and restrict ATV's to areas where they will do no harm to the environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12153    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12154    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear sir,

There are no pieceful places any more. We are not giving back to mother earth. We just constantly take and destroy for money profits and playthings. Lets get real and do all we can to protect the very life and nature we come from. Please Ban off-road stupidity from destroyng nature. Jan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12155    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I was born in North Carolina and loved to see birds and the beauty of the Outer Banks. I am an amateur bird enthusiast and I know that birds such as the Black Skimmer, Piping Plover, Sandwich Tern, Gull-billed Tern, Royal Tern and American Oystercatcher have plummeted in numbers because of the unregulated traffic of off road vehicles on the beaches. I also think that all Americans would enjoy just walking, swimming or shell hunting without being run over on those equisite beaches. I also know that the NAational Seashore at Cape Cod is doing much more to protect shore nesting birds and I don't know why the government employees at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore cannot do so as well.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12156    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the

beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12157    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12158    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12159    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12160    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12161    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

I strongly support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration and for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12162    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments--the best way to experience beaches that should be everyone's right.

Whoever decided that parks should be places for people to run rough-shod over nature? Aren't there enough other places where people routinely get to destroy or disrupt natural environments? It is outrageous that the "right" to use ORV's should ever take precedence over protecting natural areas for the many animals who live there and the people who care about them! Please stop cow-towing to industrial and assorted right-wing lobbyists, to the detriment of all those who genuinely appreciate the beauty and peace of nature--those for whom parks were created in the first place!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12163    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not



continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12164    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12165    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I was very disturbed to hear about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras Nation Seashore. Please reconsider the 26 miles of the 67 total miles of the seashore for year round wildlife and pedestrian use with open year round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife. Please, please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protection for wildlife including the piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras seashore. My family and I love to come to Hatteras each year! Wildlife needs to come first. Please don't let them down! Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12166    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12167    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The

management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

My family saw the decreasing populations of the brown pelican on Galveston Island before the ban on DDT. Their comeback within my lifetime sends me to ask for more protection of natural wildlife on our shores. Our children are so aware of their near destruction and are very conscious of the need to keep up the protection of all our wildlife. Thank you for the opportunity to address this issue. Mitzi Hardy

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12168    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and spec

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12169    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12170    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12171    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

This is an important area for families to visit. It would be appropriate for them to be able to visit without the noise and interference of ORVs.

Wildlife is very important here. Wildlife should be able to nest in an area free of ORV interference. ORVs should be kept at some distance from areas where majority of wildlife congregates to keep them protected from ORV influence.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12172    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to ban the use of any ORVs within one mile of the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers of at least one mile radius from all nesting areas. Please add other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will be stopped from degrading and destroying the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12173    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

vi appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. Please listen to us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12174    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

Stop unrestricted off road vehicles use on areas where it threatens sea turtles and shorebirds as well as other wildlife. Americans need to start learning other ways for recreation. Our beautiful land areas are being destroyed for the fun of just a few. Shame.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12175    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing the use of off-road vehicles (ORVs) at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. However, I am very concerned that the proposed regulation gives priority to ORVs on broad sections of beach; by comparison, wildlife protection is optional, as are the rights of individuals and families to enjoy beaches free of vehicles. I support balanced regulations to manage the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state, and sets aside additional areas for those uses, as well as appropriate access for ORV users.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as sufficient non-driving buffers around nests. While ORVs have their place, that should not come at the expense of wildlife or visitors looking to enjoy nature and/or peace and quiet. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12176	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12177	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	No off-road vehicles should be permitted in areas where endangered species nest. The reason for this should be apparent: if the endangered birds which the off-road vehicles want to approach are not allowed to nest in peace, soon there will be no endangered birds to approach!						

It is not true that protected areas for wildlife exist for the pleasure of humans. These areas exist so that humans in their stupidity and iniquity do not ruin the planet so that they themselves become endangered.

It is your duty as an agency of the U.S. government to serve the nation, not any particular interests within it. The long-range interests of the nation include preserving its wildlife and their habitats, which does not include off-road vehicles in areas set aside for wildlife security!

Thank you for reading these comments.

Phyllis Gibson

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12178	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12179    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am a retired Park Ranger who spent 36 1/2 years supporting conservation of natural resources and wildlife. The USNPS must live up to the 1916 declaration and defend the parks resources and wildlife against all comers!. The public has ALWAYS had ideas about park usage that are directly opposed to what should be allowed. Stick to your guns and do what is right for the park's values and resources and not what pleases the off roaders.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12180    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12181    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I was privileged to see the Pacific Snowy Plover, which has recovered along the beaches of Monterey Bay, CA, with the help of restrictions on vehicles driving on the beach. I am horrified that the US would consider making such protections for threatened and endangered birds optional. Please reconsider!

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Marcia Clouser

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12182    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please don't allow off-road vehicles to hurt wildlife in our National Parks!

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12183    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12184    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12185    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12186    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12187    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape

Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12188    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Laura Frame

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12189    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12190    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a

natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12191    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I'd like to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Regulations should not treat wildlife protection as optional. Wildlife protection is a critical purpose of the National Seashore. The proposed regulations favor the rights of ORV users over pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12192    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

WILDLIFE SHOULD NOT BE THREATENED FOR PLEASURE ACTIVITIES, specifically ORVs.

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback.

I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. THIS IS NOT ACCEPTABLE.

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state.

Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12193    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect NC's shorebird nests and sea turtles! They can't speak for themselves... Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12194    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.



---

**Correspondence ID:** 12195    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12196    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12197    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles need trails to follow and no riding zones to share the national beaches with many other users now and in the future. Nesting areas need to be protected from hikers and off road vehicles for now and the future as wildlife is an important part of our heritage and the beach experience.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12198    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

R. Martire

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12199    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12200    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

First, I support banning all ORVs and their habitat destruction. If not a complete ban, I support strict, enforceable regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses. Better yet, I support a ban on all ORVs and stiff fines for "entitled" violators.

The new regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12201    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses. As a citizen of California, I know and appreciate our beautiful coastline. It seems to me that the Calif. Coastal Commission does it's best to preserve the natural beauty and protect the native flora and fauna without kowtowing to the whims of off-roaders. People come from all over the US, and the world, to take in the magnificent views, not to listen to the roar of engines. I hope the same considerations are taken into account when reviewing your plans.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12202    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12203    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12204    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Keep off road vehicles off of the beach and out of National Parks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12205    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and speci

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12206    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We, the taxpayers, are not funding parks for joy riders. Let them buy areas to set aside for joy riding and charge admission to have funds to maintain the places. Those places are commonly referred to as race tracks, I believe. Enough said on the subject.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12207    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** it should not be an option to provide protection for the birds. we must speak for the precious wildlife that cannot speak for themselves. it would be a crime to ignore the fact that animals in our environment need to be protected. we no longer live in a

place where torture and death of endangered species is allowed. thank you for your consideration-

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12208    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12209    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12210    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12211    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few

areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Preservation and protection is ever more important to our ecosystem. Please do not consider wildlife protection optional.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12212	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12213	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12214	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The ability of animals such as shorebirds and sea turtles to survive in this precious coastal region is should be of utmost importance.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12215	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

Correspondence: Y

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12216    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. Elizabeth Cook

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12217    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Regarding the proposed regulation for ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore: The 7 national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12218    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12219    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I am an ecologist and university professor in the University of Wisconsin system.

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am seriously concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12220	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12221	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12222	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Off road vehicles are killing innocent creatures. Please enact strict speed limits. Thank you for your time.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12223	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

**Correspondence:** Please protect wildlife from the dangers of off-road vehicles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12224    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** When I go to any park, whether it is local or national, it is to enjoy nature's beauty and the great outdoor. Please keep it so and protect the wildlife that make the outdoor what it is.

Thank you, Chi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12225    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12226    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12227    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore's wildlife is seeing an encouraging increase in habitation and nesting due to the recent temporary regulations that limit ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas.

The new permanent regulations under consideration now by the National Park Service do not factor in protection for nesting areas. The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.



---

**Correspondence ID:** 12228    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Kathryn Wolford

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12229    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline. All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over. Please protect this area now!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12230    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I've vacationed in the Cape Hatteras area. My main reason for visiting is the wildlife. ORV use conflicts with my use of the area. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12231    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12232    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12233    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please enact a plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas. A temporary plan limiting ORV use has been shown to be successful at protecting wildlife. The proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is not an acceptable solution. I strongly support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12234    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12235    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12236    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12237    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I live in San Diego CA, where we are also struggling to preserve nesting areas for Snowy Plovers and Least Terns from people and dogs and predators on our beaches. I cannot imagine letting people drive on the beaches. The birds would not have any chance!

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12238    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12239    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12240    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12241    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12242    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Measures and regulations must be created to protect wildlife, not just ORV's and the recreational riders

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12243    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12244    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12245    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12246    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please come to some kind of plan to protect wildlife within Nat'l Seashore areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12247    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am sick that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, lets ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife, and I want pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for these uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12248    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12249	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12250	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs: I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12251	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12252	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31.2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12253	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31.2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I grateful for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I understand the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback in recent years. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I do support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses as they provide for areas of ORV use.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. This is a significant issue as it has a affect on both rare and common species and the great ecosystem they use to survive and thrive.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12254	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.31.2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12255    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Please care for these animals. I am a proud to be a pet owner in my own home and I hope these animals will enjoy their home in Hatteras.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12256    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** # I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12257    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As written, the proposed rule protects the rights of off road vehicles but does nothing to protect wildlife in the area or people who want to enjoy beaches free of vehicles. A balanced rule would protect wildlife from vehicles and provide places for people to enjoy beaches without vehicles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12258    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.



Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12259    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. My fondest memories in life include wildlife. Poachers, Jaguars and so many other things are such a treat to the fragile world which needs to be nurtured.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12260    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12261    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches. Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12262    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12263    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12264    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12265    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12266    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12267    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12268    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Regarding beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. The proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas and needs to be changed to accommodate the above concerns.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12269    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I camped in the spring for many years at Cape Hatteras, loving the wildness and freedom of living in the dunes.

for this reason I am commenting on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12270    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12271    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12272    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I thought this was supposed to be a progressive, environmental friendly administration. These new regulations are extremely regressive and destructive.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12273    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** There are PLENTY of trails, etc, purposely there for people with these off road vehicles, They should be MADE to stay off the beaches, our poor wildlife creatures are having a hard enough time (pollution, pesticides, etc) just trying to survive in this crazy world where no one seems to care about them anymore. Except for the few of us that still have a heart.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12274    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12275    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose opening the seashore to unrestricted vehicle access. This will only be damaging and disruptive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12276    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do all you can to protect the nesting seashore birds and the sea turtles near Cape Hatteras seashore. Not just because many like me who vacation there like to see them, but because it is their right to continue to exist. People can find other places to drive. Thank you, Gloria Lee

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12277    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** # I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12278    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12279    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12280    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I lived in Asheville, NC for seventeen years and visited the NC every year. I've walked on beaches that allowed ORV to be on them and found it very hard to walk on those beaches due to the huge ruts that are formed by the tires. I believe buffered areas around nesting areas are vital for this lovely seashore ecosystem to survive.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12281    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12282    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12283    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug,31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-

based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12284    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12285    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12286    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

Sheldon Muller

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12287    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing offroad vehical use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a wonderful comeback. That is the kind of action, and results, that make me a strong supporter of the National Park Service.

I am concerned that this positive record is about to be demolished by a turn-around in the proposed regulation. Wildlife protection should be a primary objective of the National Park Service at every natural area under its management. In addition, National Parks are intended to be places where people can enjoy nature's beauty and sounds. The proposed changes in regulations appear to give priority to use by ORV users without regard to the disruptive noise and environmental degradation caused by use of these machines.

A National Seashore should be a place where people of all ages, including those with young children, can safely enjoy the natural sounds, smells, and peace of a natural beach. ORV users should not be allowed to drive on extensive areas of the beach, disrupting and destroying the experience of others and disturbing and displacing birds and other wildlife.

I strongly support regulations that limit ORV use of the National Seashore and place protection of wildlife and the natural environment as top priority. A good management plan should set aside significant areas for these uses and strongly limit uses that will ultimately degrade the beauty and wildness of the area. Please add driving buffers around bird nests, and other protections to the regulation to ensure that ORVs will not dominate and degrade this beautiful place.

The National Park Service is entrusted with the care of this special area for the benefit of all current and future generations. Please do your best to meet this obligation so that our children's children can someday enjoy it's wild beauty too.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12288    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please allow nesting and beach wildlife to be born, grow and thrive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12289    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Our wildlife is part of our national heritage. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12290    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect Cape Hatteras seashore. Do not allow ORVs at the expense of wildlife. There are many bird species as well as turtles that nest there and need protection. Please do not sacrifice them for ORVs!! Thank you, Nancy Parsons

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12291    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Aug.31,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** P.S. I Love Wildlife love Brandon M Bean. AND FOR OUR KIDS LIVE & THEY FUTURE TO.

"In this great future, you can't forget your past..." Bob Marley

P.S. I Love Wildlife love Brandon M Bean.

Thank you for helping to save these executives why saving the Western Gray Whale important.



Thank you for considering my comments. I look forward to your swift action to ensure a complete ban on whaling in Iceland.

Sincerely,

Thank you for your consideration of this issue.

Thank you for considering my views on this issue. I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely, Thank you for considering my views on this issue. I look forward to your reply.

Yours truly, Thank you for considering my comments. Thank you for taking my concerns into consideration. Sincerely, Thank you for considering my comments. P.S. I Love Wildlife love Brandon M Bean. Thank you for receiving my comments. Sincerely, Brandon M Bean 2019 Los Feliz dr Apt 8 Thousand Oaks CA 91362-3030 Brandonmbean@yahoo.com I love 8stops7 They Rock. <http://www.8stops7.com> Thank you for considering and conveying my message to your government. Sincerely, Brandon M Bean 805.657.7565

I love 8stops7 They Rock. <http://www.8stops7.com>

<http://www.facebook.com/brandon.m.bean>

Sincerely,

BRANDON M BEAN 805-657-7565

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12292	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12293	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. Please do not do anything that would jeopardize this comeback. The proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I am tired of organizations that are supposed to protect nature caving in to people who own ORVs. The Seashore must include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for ORV users. I suspect owners of these vehicles have no interest in preserving nature; only their own pleasure in destroying natural plants, animals or anything that they can ride over.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12294	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will protect the species that depend on the Seashore only if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12295    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** stop letting vehicles destroy shore bird habitat.. do your duty to curtail wanton destruction!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12296    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12297    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** P.S. I Love Wildlife love Brandon M Bean. AND FOR OUR KIDS LIVE & THEY FUTURE TO.

"In this great future, you can't forget your past..." Bob Marley

P.S. I Love Wildlife love Brandon M Bean.

Thank you for helping to save these executives why saving the Western Gray Whale important.

Thank you for considering my comments. I look forward to your swift action to ensure a complete ban on whaling in Iceland.

Sincerely,

Thank you for your consideration of this issue.

Thank you for considering my views on this issue. I look forward to your reply.

Sincerely, Thank you for considering my views on this issue. I look forward to your reply.

Yours truly, Thank you for considering my comments. Thank you for taking my concerns into consideration. Sincerely, Thank you for considering my comments. P.S. I Love Wildlife love Brandon M Bean. Thank you for receiving my comments. Sincerely, Brandon M Bean 2019 Los Feliz dr Apt 8 Thousand Oaks CA 91362-3030 Brandonmbean@yahoo.com I love 8stops7 They Rock. <http://www.8stops7.com> Thank you for considering and conveying my message to your government. Sincerely, Brandon M Bean 805.657.7565

I love 8stops7 They Rock. <http://www.8stops7.com>

<http://www.facebook.com/brandon.m.bean>

Sincerely,

BRANDON M BEAN 805-657-7565

**Correspondence ID:** 12298    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12299    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I write to you because I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulations for managing the use of off-road vehicles (ORVs) on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the regulations that were recently established, the area's protected wildlife has benefited considerably. Among other things, sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Also, piping plovers and other shorebirds are making a comeback.

Unfortunately, the Park Service's proposed new regulations would protect beach drivers far more than wildlife. Expanding the use of ORVs could very well eliminate all the gains that the area's wildlife have made in recent years.

As currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional. This is unacceptable; I urge you strongly to push for maintaining current buffers and making sure plans are in place that explicitly protect species like piping plovers and sea turtles that depend on the Cape Hatteras shoreline.

This area has suffered much damage in Hurricane Irene, and endangering the wildlife that needs this shoreline will definitely damage it even more. I encourage you in the strongest possible terms to push through the right policies that will maintain Cape Hatteras as a lasting legacy for our children's children. Thank you.

Sincerely, Steven Kranowski

**Correspondence ID:** 12300    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such

as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12301    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off-road vehicles off of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12302    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12303    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect the wildlife on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12304    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12305    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12306    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12307    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for accepting my concerned comments.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Desmond 1072 Casitas Pass 216 Carpinteria CA 93013

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12308    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I ask you to more carefully protect the wildlife..at Hatteras The off road vehicles are death to the birds...they need sanctuary Do not let careless humans and wild drivers tear up our wildlife protection areas and cause harm to the bird families trying to survive Make the laws stringent....protect wildlife and vacationing families from more traffic and people who tear up the beaches and areas of sanctuary

Please help...the helpless

Thank you

Frequent visitor to your area

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12309    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Shannon Matare

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12310	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There should be no off road vehicles in this amazing place killing wildlife. It's retarded.						

Tracey

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12311	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Off-shore-vehicle-use is absolutely harmful to wildlife. It is unnecessary to threaten the habitats of animals and ruin our ecosystem. Please don't permit this.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12312	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I understand that you are currently promulgating regulations governing usage of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I would like to go on record as being very much opposed to allowing off-road vehicles and ATVs to encroach upon the nesting areas of shorebirds and other fragile wildlife, not to mention the wear and tear on our public lands by these intrusive machines.						

The wildlife have a difficult enough time trying to come back from the devastations of the past 10+ years. The last thing they need is to be crushed beneath the wheels of some rollicking gangs of people in infernal machines.

Please close all nesting areas on the beach to AT traffic.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12313	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such

as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12314    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12315    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Having lived on an island for the first 36 years of my life, I know the importance of multi-use, yet as an environmentalist I know the importance of proper stewardship and the saving "all" our flora and fauna.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12316    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** # I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12317    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12318	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a lifelong bird and nature watcher, I know how valuable Cape Hatteras is to the birds who instinctively nest there. I also know how much money birdwatchers invest in that area watching birds. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12319	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12320	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There should not be any type of vehicles on seashores. Our wildlife must be protected.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12321	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						



**Correspondence:** Please keep otv vehivles out of Cape Hatteras,N.C. to protect wildlife. It is there survival verses people's entertainment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12322    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12323    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** QUIT LETTING LITTLE BIRDS GET SMASHED BY VEHICLES ON OUR BEACHES!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12324    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12325    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Please keep ATV's out of National Parks!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12326    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12327    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12328    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12329    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12330    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12331    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12332    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12333    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12334    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Simply as a very very concerned grandmother, I ask that the human race awaken and realize that it is man with our so-called progress, and loud mechanical machines who are killing our wildlife. Our balances in nature and continuing to be disturbed and thrown out of balances with mans interference on all levels.

Loud off road vehicles absolutely must be BAN from all seashores where birds congregate, lay their eggs, raise their young, and make all attempts to somehow survive all the ravages inflicted upon them. We must preserve all wildlife, and provide for the future of our youth.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12335    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Rare birds and sea turtles need the protection of the science based management protection plan currently in use. Please extend this protection beyond the current 4 years as this program has been of the utmost importance in helping endangered species begin to recover.

Appreciatively,

Marian Derby

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12336    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12337    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do all that you can to protect these special creatures at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Their existence, their unique-ness is commingled with ours.

It would be a travesty to allow sports vehicles to invade their territory - all in the spirit of fun - while their nests and offspring are decimated!

Please.....BE WISE.....protect these special creatures. They are a part of our history, our present, and our future. They must be protected. Thank you.

Deidre Silverman, San Rafael, Ca. 94901

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12338    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure. I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the

Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12339    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12340    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As Travel facilitator-Interpreter, I realize the monumental importance for all the National Parks, because they are the property of the American people and they generate tourism dollars for all businesses around them. Not understand that is sheer stupidity..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12341    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12342    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12343    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Regarding the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore: Sea turtles and beach-nesting birds are coming back thanks to current management policies, which are now being threatened by the proposed regulations. I am against allowing ORVs the run of the beaches at the expense of wildlife and people who want to enjoy the beach in its natural state. Regulations should include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians. Buffers and other wildlife protections should be added to the regulation so that ORVs will not destroy the Seashore. Please strive to protect the Seashore for the wildlife and people, not vehicles.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12344    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am a frequent visitor to Cape Hatteras and my family is from the area originally. I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12345    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12346    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** wildlife along the seashore is part of our ecosystem- "off road vehicles" are not. not only do they threaten this system, they use up valuable and limited oil and pollute the air.

please consider the whole picture when adopting these regulations. i have seen the damage these vehicles can do in on the seashore in baja, mexico and i would hate to think we would allow this in the united states of america.

susan wu

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12347    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12348    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** How can anyone conceive of a future minus our birds, animals, wildlife and environmental items of all sorts? This would be a hideous existence! These naysayers should be punished for ideas like these!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12349    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I have visited the Gulf, Atlantic, Pacific coasts, as well as the great lakes and it is obvious to me that all of these areas are beginning to show severe decline in suitable habitat for wildlife because of overuse and development. A national seashore should be a place of refuge for wildlife. The imprint of human activity should be kept to a minimum. Environmental education and other nature focused activities that are unobtrusive and not detrimental to wildlife, especially during breeding times, should be the main focus of any management program.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12350    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate work being done to protect wild life that lives and nests along the seashore. Please ensure that specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting birds, are included in the new regulations. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12351    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** stop people from driving on the beach now. this is a national sea shore not a highway for morons, i have come to the outer banks almost every year since the 1970s and things are out of control there anymore and have been for some time. we must protect these areas now.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12352    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It is of utmost importance that we protect and preserve wildlife at all times. Please help to protect wildlife today!! Thank you, God Bless You!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12353    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12354    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12355    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Off Road Vehicles off the beaches of National Parks, including the Cape Hatteras Seashore. The danger to nesting animals can not be tolerated, just so that some few people can have some thrills!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12356    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** please protect more area for species that are threatened and increase the area of no beach driving

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12357    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the proposed regulations for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore, since with the



current interim plan, protected wildlife has done very well.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Steve

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12358    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12359    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12360    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12361    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12362    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am adding my voice to the many who advocate for wildlife not to be sacrificed to vehicle trauma in proposed regulations.

It is distressing to see how little appreciation there is for wildlife and their inherent right to share this planet with us.

Conversely, it would be a major step in the right direction if wildlife were put first at Cape Hatteras.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12363    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. We are very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. We support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Wendy Morseth

Martie Sucec

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12364    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12365    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12366    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please oppose unrestricted off-road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles and other wildlife, including but not limited to the National Park Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12367    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12368    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12369    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12370	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12371	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. I have enjoyed the pristine spaces of this area in the past and it is distressing to think that it cannot be preserved for future generations to enjoy.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12372	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We need to protect Earth's habitats to the fullest extent. If we do not, not only will our children and future generations not have a place to live, the human race will eventually extinguish. Ecology 101 guys!						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12373	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Hello, Sea turtles ar living for million years on Earth, but they were never as endangered as they are now. As I understand that the tourists and local people have also the right to use the beach, we must ensure that there is enough habitat for the sea turtles nesting areas and for the seabirds. Beach driving is not a good idea. Thank you very much for letting the public send you comments on this important issue. Yours faithfully						

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12374    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12375    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12376    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect animals on Cape Hatteras.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12377    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Sea turtles, especially loggerheads, are losing many of their traditional nesting sites to shore developments. We need to protect the shoreline locations they can still use as nesting sites - especially from vehicular traffic. A driver could easily overrun a nest without realizing it. These turtles are already endangered and deserve our help for the species to survive. We can still enjoy these beaches on foot while easily avoiding their nesting sites.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12378    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12379	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12380	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						
	The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.						
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12381	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						
	Here in Texas with the open beaches, we watch as Least Tern nests are destroyed by ORV's, regularly people are run over by vehicles driving on the beach, and just wanton flushing of birds which wastes their scarce reserves.						
	The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.						
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12382	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Vehicles of any kind, other than beach maintenance vehicles and safety vehicles should never be allowed on any beaches anywhere. Americans are too fat and inactive as it is. Let them walk to the shores. Allowing vehicles degrades the shore, kills wildlife and endangers the people, as well. It is a lazy, ridiculous, destructive behavior. The entertainment of human beings is NOT as important as the integrity of the environment. No one is entitled to harm our shorelines. It must stop now!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12383	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray, As someone who values the wildplaces and wildlife preserved and protected by the NPS, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park						

Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

Dr. Janna M. Crews

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12384    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore is not a highway for ATVs to run rough shod over people and wildlife. These proposed regulations would harm the environment. My vote is "Do not pass."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12385    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12386    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am a resident of Southern Shores on the Outer Banks. I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12387    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include

specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12388    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12389    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback.

We are very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

We support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12390    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12391    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y



**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12392    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12393    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12394    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** you're gonna miss those big fat birds/turtles when they're gone... They're another of the canary in the coal mines. We'll fade away like them if they do.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12395    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please lets all do what is necessary to save what is left of our world for all to enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12396    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape

Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12397    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12398    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12399    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made

a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12400    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12401    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** VUnder the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12402    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12403    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few

areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12404    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

Although I presently live in Illinois, I grew up in Seattle loving the ocean. I have spent time on your shores and have been grateful for the beauty. Honestly, having this disturbed by motor vehicles breaks my heart. The disregard for its wildlife angers me. The following includes statistics that I couldn't have developed on my own, so please overlook the "form letter" aspect of it. The sentiments are real! Thank you for taking this information under advisement.

Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Debi Lee

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12405    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** National Parks are their to protect wildlife while allowing people to observe. They were never intended to be resorts, places for off-road vehicles, places for sporting events, boats, fishing and hunting grounds or anything else except to protect and preserve our national spaces for everyone. No more power boats and off-road vehicles!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12406    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Jay Hales

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12407    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I have personally experienced ORV users that came way to close to my daughter who is deaf. They have a devil may care and get out of my way attitude. It would be far more appropriate to move this type of activity to an area where there are no other living creatures. (Hell would work) ORV use is the pass time of idiots. It is a mindless, noisy, stinky thing to do that is destructive and dangerous. Just look at the number of injuries that the use of recreational ORV's cause. It is staggering, we should make it harder for them to do this not facilitate their wanton destruction!! I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12408    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please take steps to safeguard flora and fauna from ORV. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12409    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It's YOUR JOB TO PROTECT ALL LIFE! IT'S A CIRCLE & WHAT WE LET HAPPEN TO ENVIRONMENT & subspecies will happen to humans!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12410    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect wildlife and wild lands at the Caper Hatteras National Seashore from off road vehicle recreation. It is an inappropriate and incompatible use in this type of environment which should be preserved primarily for nature and passive uses that do not threaten or harm the natural environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12411    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this

plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12412    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12413    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12414    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect the Cape Hatteras National Seashore by preventing unrestricted off-road vehicles. It is our duty to protect these endangered shorebirds and sea turtles. We need to protect those that can't protect themselves, It is our Duty!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12415    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12416    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12417	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12418	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.						

Yet the proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

We support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12419	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few						

areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12420    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12421    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Enough with the killing of wild life. No off road vehicles. Even thoe an animal has a lower I.Q. than a human, they can feel just as much pain and suffering as we can. Sincerely, Carl Hoffmeister

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12422    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** he regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for your kind time and attention to this important matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12423    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape



Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12424    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore does not sufficiently protect Cape Hatteras wildlife.

The current temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife. The new regulation should continue this protection, which has proven to be a success story for the protected turtles and piping plovers. These are precious icons of Cape Hatteras.

Thank You.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12425    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE regulate ORV's, which do such great, and preventable, damage to our beaches and precious wildlife! Thank you! Joan Birch Missoula MT

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12426    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles, which created only 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be adversely affected.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it protects wildlife! The proposed plan sets aside only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use, with the remainder open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional. This unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife such as piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the natural state of the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12427    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12428    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12429    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to you today in behalf of the 800+ members of the Napa-Solano Audubon Society as a member of its conservation committee on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. We are very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Sincerely, Robin L.C. Leong Member of Napa-Solano Audubon Society Conservation committee

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12430    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I cannot imagine why it is more important to allow folks riding on ATVs, etc., to drive their fume-immitting, gas-smelling, ear-splitting, nest disturbing, beach-wrecking fun-toys on our once pristine beaches. I realize that people love to have a place to spin wheelies and such, but that is one out-door experience that needs to be kept clear of our ocean beaches, and river beds. There are plenty of empty spaces where it has already been destroyed by asphalt and the like that they can use. Maybe even abandoned gravel pits? The EPA is a special gift to the people of the U.S. It helps preserve our wonders and our wonderful enviroment. Please help us to retain what beauty we have left. And leave the air and water clean.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12431    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** people go to see the wildlife as well.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12432    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As a farm forester I learned many years ago the damage ORV riders can do to a landscape and the plants and animals that depend on it. Damage was not limited to the landscape as the fences were cut and newly planted trees were destroyed. That is why I am commenting on the proposed regulation for managing ORV use at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. There is no

high priority need for ORVs to have access throughout this wonderful area. The protection of turtles and nesting birds must have the priority over thrill-craft. However the proposed regulation seems to consider wildlife protection as secondary. In addition there is little consideration for providing protected areas for humans to safely enjoy the natural quiet of vehicle-free beaches. Instead the regulation promotes and favors the rights of ORV users to drive extensively throughout the beach without concern for the rights of humans and wildlife. It is time to aggressively manage and restrict ORV use within the Seashore to limit adverse impacts on other uses. The regulation must include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and human visitors who want to experience natural solitude of the beach. The management plan must give priority to natural uses of the beach and not promote willy-nilly use and abuse by ORV riders. The regulation must protect species that depend on the Seashore by regulation that mandates specific, science-based protections, such as restrictive buffers around nesting areas. The adverse impacts of ORVs are extensive and effective management can only be achieved through enforceable restrictions and buffers to protect wildlife and humans. You must not consider ORV riders to dominate and degrade our Seashore. Our public lands must be managed for the majority of users and not just the noisy riders of ORVs.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for considering my comments. Please keep me informed of your decisions regarding this important issue

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12433    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do the right thing and protect wildlife! Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12434    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am extremely concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12435    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12436    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

Quite simply, KEEP THEM OFF THE BEACHES!

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

We are trashing our planet at an alarming rate. It is time we acted to STOP the destruction!

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12437	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12438	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I do not live in the area but I do vacation. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. These birds and turtles need our protection as many species are being driven to the brink near extinction and need our protection. Thank you for your consideration in this matter..

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12439	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such

as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12440    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** the proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12441    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12442    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I would like to have as much of the beaches at Cape Hatteras made off-limits to off-road vehicles as possible. I believe this is necessary to protect the birds and other wildlife that nest there and rest there during migrations.

Use by off-road vehicles also erodes sand dunes, which protect our shores from storm surges.

Citizens should be able to enjoy these wild places on foot, without motorized traffic imperiling the wild life and plants.

Thank you for your time and attention.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12443    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few

areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12444	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.						

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12445	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	"I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.						

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12446	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12447    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12448    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12449    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

I live near the coast and it is a joy to watch and listen to these beautiful creatures early in the morning twittering and singing. I

could not imagine our planet without birds. We need to protect and nurture them as much as possible. It's like God entrusted them to us to care and protect them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12450    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches. Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive, so if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed. The proposed regulation only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving. All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over. I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12451    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12452    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** These are my comments on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore:

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you,

Roman LoBianco

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12453    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.



The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12454    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12455    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12456    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Janet Gimblet

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12457    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicle drivers are a small portion of those who visit Cape Hatteras National Seashore each year, but they are among the most vocal. In order to speak up for all of the piping plovers, sea turtles, sea and shore birds and all of the other wildlife that relies on this region, please do not allow ORVs to destroy wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12458    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Do the right thing.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12459    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We need to protect our wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12460    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Special Regulations, Areas of National Park System: Cape Hatteras National Seashore

I oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shore birds and other wildlife. Stop being so bloody selfish and give other species a chance. S Selwood.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12461    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am in Raleigh each year and each year I travel down to Cape Hatteras, only because I try to get a glimpse at the wildlife. But I get the feeling that recreational activities, although important are taking over. Together with my feeling it is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based

protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

I therefore appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you for considering these comments and for the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12462    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Please make sure these protections are re-included for the health of the Park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12463    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We need our parks and we need animal protection. There are trails for ORVs make them use them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12464    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12465    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I also would like to add that even though time restraints prevent me from enjoying the Parks as much as I would like, I believe that they are very important and valuable. The thought that they are not adequately protected and may be left to our descendants in worse condition than what our generation received them sickens me.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12466    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** . I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12467    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12468    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please Prevent Vehicle Death in Cape Hatteras

Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed.

Let's do the right thing,

Sincerely,

Candice

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12469    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As a frequent visitor to our National Parks, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. Wildlife protection needs to be made permanent. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12470    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12471    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thanking you for your time.

Yours Sincerely

Joanna Attard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12472    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please

add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12473    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12474    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12475    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Decades of unregulated beach driving have pushed the birds at Cape Hatteras National Seashore - a globally significant Important Bird Area - to the brink. Populations of waterbirds that nest on the Seashore's beaches, like Least Terns and Black Skimmers, plummeted 84% in just ten years from 1997 to 2007. Rare sea turtles were also suffering alarming declines. Audubon and other conservation groups successfully pushed for a temporary science-based management plan, which, in just four years, has allowed these birds and turtles to make a comeback.

Now the National Park Service is proposing new, permanent regulations for off-road vehicle use on the Seashore's beaches that jeopardize much-needed wildlife protections and put the future for birds like the Piping Plover, Least Tern, Black Skimmer, and many other shorebird species in doubt.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12476    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Dear NPS,

I have long been a fan of the NPS, and have the good fortune of living within 15 minutes of Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore in Michigan. I understand that the service needs to provide for a diversity of uses and that it may be tempted to accommodate the current ORV fad. However, the national parks have long been depended upon to provide Americans with the opportunity to enjoy and appreciate a natural experience, a connection with nature. Opportunities for citizens to drive ORVs abound. Opportunities for connecting with nature in a fairly natural state along our beaches do not, and are dwindling. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, by allowing ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to

visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should set aside additional areas for those us that thirst for opportunities to enjoy nature and wildlife away from the din of ORVs. To not protect wildlife and nature in this manner would be counter to the mission and purpose of the NPS.

Thank you. Scott Hickman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12477    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I regularly receive communications from the National Audubon Society, as well as the New Jersey Audubon Society, informing me of important issues and events in the birding community. I treasure the natural world and feel it is imperative to retain as much undisturbed areas as possible. We have taken over so much of the planet for our human activities, we need to remember that we, as well as all other creatures, need natural areas - for all of the needs in our life cycles. I have cut and pasted many of the comments from Audubon, but wanted to add my own comments to underscore that I feel very strongly about preservation.

I understand that under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Our shores on the east coast are a limited resource - and will probably become more limited in the future. Please bear all of the above in you mind while making decisions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12478    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12479    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12480    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12481    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12482    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very alarmed at the proposed tepid regulations. The right to enjoy the beach does not extend to the right to drive over the eggs and chicks of endangered birds.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12483    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE PROTECT WILDLIFE ON CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12484    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not



continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12485    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The National Parks has to be more specific with their protection of the beach nesting areas. Merely naming a percentage of the beach does nothing to protect specific nesting areas. Each season the nesting sites need to be identified, then specifically protected from 4WDs. Closing that section of the beach OR fencing off specific sties would both work because the actual site is being protected. We all need to think ahead of the next election so there is actually some wildlife around for future generations . Thankyou Patricia Milthorpe

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12486    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12487    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12488    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** These vehicles are the playthings of idiots. Please ban them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12489    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12490    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the

beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I always enjoy doing photography and just sitting to watch the wildlife. I would like to continue in this, knowing the wildlife is cared for and will be there for my children and their children to enjoy and nurture.

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12491	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Stop the tar sand pipeline						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12492	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12493	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12494	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12495    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please stop off road vehicles destroying these habitats. Must humans be everywhere and kill off everything in our path? What monsters we have become.....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12496    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** the birds and turtles were there first before people and off road vehicles-keep the people and vehicles off and leave the birds and turtles alone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12497    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. Therfor visit regulations are needful. Road vehicles should not be allowed to use huge portions of the Seashore. The birds nests and chicks could be disturbed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12498    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The National Park System must protect the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and its wildlife by NOT allowing unrestricted off road vehicle use in this national treasure.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12499    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12500    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the

beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12501    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12502    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12503    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Concerning the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds fortunately have made a tremendous comeback. However, I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife, who have equal rights to the beach! I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, SCIENCE-BASED protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please consider adding buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. We must all live together in this world. Planning intelligently for the ORV's will give pleasure to the people who want to use them, as well as save our wonderful wildlife that must at all costs be protected, since they cannot speak for themselves.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12504    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12505    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Jimmie Lunsford

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12506    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12507    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made

a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12508    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12509    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** To Whom this May Concern,

Why would anyone want to use their vehicles as weapons to kill innocent wildlife? Why wouldn't you put in place regulations to prohibit this abuse of God's precious creations? Don't we kill enough? Pretty soon all the wildlife will be a picture of what it use to be like to enjoy the beautiful wildlife, no one will have a memory because it was mutilated by the greedy human civilization. Don't wait till there is nothing left! Please do the honorable thing and step out to do the right thing for all humanity and stand tall to know you did your part for these beautiful animals and nature that is growing sparse as we write!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12510    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12511    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the

beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12512    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12513    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12514    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I want you to know I am concerned with the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing offroad vehical use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a wonderful comeback. That is the kind of action, and results, that make me a strong supporter of the National Park Service.

I am concerned that this positive record is about to be demolished by a turn-around in the proposed regulation. Wildlife protection should a primary objective of the National Park Service at every natural area under its management. In addition, National Parks are intended to be places where people can enjoy nature's beauty and sounds. The proposed changes in regulations appear to give priority to use by ORV users without regard to the disruptive noise and environmental degradation caused by use of these machines.

A National Seashore should be a place where people of all ages, including those with young children, can safely enjoy the natural sounds, smells, and peace of a natural beach. ORV users should not be allowed to drive on extensive areas of the beach, disrupting and destroying the experience of others and disturbing and displacing birds and other wildlife.

I strongly support regulations that limit ORV use of the National Seashore and place protection of wildlife and the natural environment as top priority. A good management plan should set aside significant areas for these uses and strongly limit uses that will ultimately degrade the beauty and wildness of the area. Please add driving buffers around bird nests, and other

protections to the regulation to ensure that ORVs will not dominate and degrade this beautiful place.

The National Park Service is entrusted with the care of this special area for the benefit of all current and future generations. Please do your best to meet this obligation so that our children's children can someday enjoy it's wild beauty too.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12515    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Other than emergency vehicles, I really can't see a need for recreational vehicles to operate on a shoreline. An exception might be approved commercially operated small engine vehicles, with restrictions based on top speed. I live in a coastal community and am often shocked by how destructive people are towards wildlife in the area. If the government doesn't do anything to protect our natural wildlife, we won't have to worry about it in a hundred years- there simply won't be any.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12516    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Driving on the beach is just stupid! This should be banned everywhere.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12517    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12518    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.



---

**Correspondence ID:** 12519    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Regarding ORV usage of Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I would hope that it continues to be strongly regulated so that birds and turtles that use the beach for nesting can be protected and the beaches can be enjoyed by those who value peace and quiet. I believe that scientifically proven protective measures should be used to the fullest extent possible, as beach nesting creatures are highly vulnerable to the disturbance caused by ORVs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12520    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12521    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Or, better yet, restrict ORV usage to emergency vehicles only. I grew up regularly visiting an aunt and uncle who lived at the beach. At that time, ORV usage was non-existent. In addition to the impact the ORV's have on the natural habitats, I believe unrestricted usage will eventually affect the tourism as well. I know I would seek beaches that restricted ORV's for my family's vacations.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12522    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a

natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12523    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** FOR ONCE DO THE RIGHT THING. ARE PARKS ARE SO PRECIOUS BUT THAT JUST DOES NOT SEEM TO MEAN ANYTHING TO OUR GOVERNMENT.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12524    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please follow the advice of Wildlife organizations, as well as environmental groups, the EPA, etc.

We should avoid all vehicles that would kill or endanger any birds or other wildlife.

We need to stop harming marine life and the coastal areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12525    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I wanted to take a moment to comment regarding the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles created more nests, piping plovers and other shorebirds are in the process of rebounding.

It seems to me that if you expand off road vehicle use across the Seashore, that it will only threaten and endanger the wildlife.

I strongly support regulation of off road vehicles at the Seashore. The Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. I feel that more vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional. It should not be optional.

I urge you to please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12526    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for allowing me to share my thoughts on the Cape Hatteras area and the beautiful eastern coastline. Please include in this bill that ORV's have separate routes away from the wildlife and protect this area. There are far to few natural shoreline areas left on this earth to enjoy. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12527    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback - but this took time and much effort. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife

protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12528	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12529	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a Birdwatcher and lover of Wild Life I urge you to help us continue our efforts to help keep our beach natural. For vacationers like me who come to Cape Hatteras for the beauty and the Wild Life. It is terrible to have off road vehicles intruding. The natural disasters take enough of a toll with out adding to insult.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12530	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12531	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses						

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12532    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12533    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** As is usual government personnel couldn't care less about wild life.

STOP vehicles driving on beaches NOW and forever!

It sickens me when politicians and greedy firms and individuals kill God's creatures so that they can have their fun.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12534    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We need to preserve this area and keep it natural and pristine. I vacation there and find this to be a beautiful area that I do not want harmed .

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Donna Pfeffer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12535    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** The use of off shore vehicles anywhere near wildlife should be strictly prohibited. Their noise and pollution is disturbing as well as dangerous. Vehicles like these should only be allowed in paved fenced in areas away from the habitat of seabirds and sea turtles.

Sea turtles nest at night, any light will prevent them from nesting successfully. Lights from these vehicles will cause them to return to sea. There is also the added danger from these vehicles to their nests.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12536    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear US National Park Service, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. Jean Marie Naples, MD-Ph.D.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12537    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Good Day:

As someone who frequents the Outer Banks, I wish to comment upon your proposed changes to policies governing ORV use on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12538    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12539    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include

specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12540    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12541    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Our beaches are under constant assault from both natural and man-made depreddations. We must do everything we can to protect our precious and vulnerable shoreline. The shore of Brooklyn and Long Island New York are especially important to me and my family for recreation, birdwatching and general observation of the coastal environment. Please do not allow vehicles to spoil this precious resource.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12542    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12543    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Would you like random people riding loud, destructive vehicles through your home?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12544    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** ALL birds, and other wildlife must be saved, and not harmed in any way. thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12545    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very interested in protecting the wild life of our National Seashore by limited the off season driving of vehicles in the nesting areas of the shoreline. We have plenty of roads to drive on, can't we leave some places for nature to function normally?The National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National should focus on protecting our environment from recreational vehicles not allowing them to destroy the characteristics that make this area so special.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12546    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Respect natural beauty and respect the earthly environment that supports our own species. Set limits on the carelessness, selfishness and neglect that have wiped out so much that is good. Stop abusing wildlife and ecosystems.

**Correspondence ID:** 12547    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12548    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It's important that we not lose the natural beauty of our country, it by bit. Protect beaches everywhere

**Correspondence ID:** 12549    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12550    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Mark B Bartosik

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12551    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12552    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12553    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12554    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to comment on the National Park Service's proposal for off road vehicle driving on the beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I visit the area to enjoy the wonders of the natural landscape and wildlife not to see and be stressed by people barreling up and down the beach in their 4 wheelers. These are beautiful, natural areas that don't need to be trashed by a small group of special interest recreation. I am aware that in recent years the birds and wild life have enjoyed a come-back in the Seashore because of the restrictions on vehicle access to the beaches. I am concerned that changes in the regulations will once again put nature and wildlife at risk for the few, and I'm sure very rich and vocal, who feel the restrictions hamper their lifestyle. However, as a tourist I also have economic impact on the area and I support regulations to manage or outright ban ORVs within the Seashore.

---



**Correspondence ID:** 12555    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

there are plenty of roads, we do not need to make beaches more accessible to the detriment of life that makes them so attractive to begin with! I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12556    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12557    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12558    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and

pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12559	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	How much more can the wildlife take? I'm sure hurricane Irene had a damaging effect and now legislation may be passed to pollute the beaches and destroy the habitats of birds and sea turtles that are on the brink of extinction. I have visited beautiful Cape Hatteras and would like to walk on that beach again without dodging vehicles or stepping on animals that can't protect themselves from mankind. You can make that change if you care.						

Vicky Castronovo

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12560	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service's current proposed plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The plan only sets aside 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving						

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

Please consider amending the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife. It is not fair to allow a small percentage of visitors to a shared national resource to damage it in a way that diminishes its value for the rest of us.

Thank you for taking your protective mandate seriously and considering comments from those of us who want our beautiful, wild areas to remain vibrant for generations to come.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12561	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12562	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	ORVs should not be allowed in any national park - period. Ninety percent of riders have only one purpose and that is to rip and tear, making a game out of killing wildlife and seeing who can dig the deepest holes in whatever soil or waterway they come across. The proof is in the specialized magazines where the articles explain how and the ads make light of the destruction because "there is so much power!" Thinking your rangers can stop these rampages is delusional.						

The ONLY users who should be permitted to access the parks by ORV are disabled and/or elderly on machines that have limited horsepower.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12563    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12564    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for your attention to this critical issue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12565    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12566    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made

a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12567	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

Like/believe it or not, we are all stewards of the environment and, whether winged, furred or otherwise, we are to share this earth. Supposedly, our species is the more intelligent. We create the problems, therefore we should be the ones to solve them. I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12568	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12569	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12570    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Wildlife, in my opinion, has a very difficult time surviving due to human stupidity. Driving anywhere an animal in nesting, etc. should not be prohibited.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12571    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I used to live in Williamsburg, VA and took several trips to Hatteras area and actually was amazed by the nesting terns. I could not believe back then in the 80's that off road vehicles were allowed on the shore...Stupid, stupid stupid. Even if birds were not nesting the pollution caused by fossil fueled vehicles just makes no sense in such sensitive areas. There are enough natural disasters...like recent hurricane Irene to make this an even more stupid idea...

I say do not allow off road driving on the beaches and sensitive areas...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12572    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service, Please do not allow off road vehicles to destroy this beautiful shoreline. The wildlife and people coming to enjoy a quiet day on the beach, to me, are more important than than the rights of a few people whose actions would permanently damage this beautiful area. Thanks, Dave Shope

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12573    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12574    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12575    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12576    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I have lived on the beach in Delaware for 63 years. It is the great gift of nature and needs constant protection and replenishing. The Park systems are not there to be destroyed by the recreational desires of a few destructive people and their obnoxious machines. Get them OUT!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12577    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

People go to the shore for the peaceful atmosphere not to hear and be bothered by noisy ATVs. If they wanted that, they'd be sitting on the road!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12578    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12579    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12580	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	America is a beautiful place; from its snow topped peaks to its bleach white shorelines, the natural beauty and wildlife that surrounds us is unmatched in the world. Unfortunately, this natural beauty is in danger due to irresponsible citizens who threaten our wildlife's very existence. Off road vehicles, or ORVs, are carving up the beautiful coastline of Cape Hatteras National Seashore, a national landmark that exemplifies the natural beauty our land holds. Wild birds and sea turtles numbers are declining due to these off road vehicles intruding on their breeding and feeding grounds further harming the survival of American wildlife species. My representatives, I am not asking that you start a full on war against the ORV community from ever enjoying their pastime, I simply ask that you regulate their activity to areas that will not harm the animals or environment so crucial to wild birds, sea turtles, and other sea wildlife within the vicinity. I, being a believer of balanced opinion and action, feel that a decision can be made that satisfies both the ORV and wildlife conservation communities. I believe that you will find this solution that people may enjoy recreational activities without harming the natural environment that we as humans must share with the animals around us. Thank you, Jackson Ohane						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12581	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am asking for the future sake of my children and grandchildren and what they may have to appreciate in the years to come, please consider the following. I have worked hard to instill a love for nature and wildlife in all my children, allow them the opportunity to enjoy it all. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12582	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Nora Nielsen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12583    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** My family has been vacationing on the outer banks for years; my daughter lives in nearby Kill Devil Hills. We have been so relieved that the NPS has stepped up to its responsibility to speak and protect the natural resources, including sea turtles and beach-nesting birds in this area. Of course, as a result of recent activity, these species have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I appreciate the opportunity to submit these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12584    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I enjoy ORVs, but their use should be limited to areas that will not threaten the environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12585    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12586    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to express my opposition to the unrestricted use of off-road vehicles in areas in which they threaten wildlife. Our natural world is more important than joy riding.

Thank you for your attention,

Kelly Washburn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12587    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12588    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00



**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I deplore the use of any ORV's in places pf wildlife habitat. All such vehicles should at least be confined to areas provided for them. The best would be to ban the vehicles all together.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12589    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12590    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. With the damage that hurricane Irene has done to the east coast, more than ever we need to protect Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12591    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12592    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include

specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12593    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration and the opportunity to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12594    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12595    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12596    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests!

Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore!

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12597    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Please protect the interconnected web of all life.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12598    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12599    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such

as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12600    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. regards, Tyree Tanner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12601    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please restrict the use of Off Road Vehicles in the Cape Hatteras area as much as possible to protect the endangered birds, turtles, and other wildlife that need a safe environment in which to exist and reproduce. Thank you. Rhonda Hungerford

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12602    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. I visit this area often and spend my tourist dollars there. I do this because of the unique natural environment and do not want to be run over or see wildlife chased off by ORVs.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12603    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed rule because (1) I do not think it provides adequate protection for the wildlife whose habitats are disturbed by off-road vehicle use on Outer Banks beaches and (2) the ruts and debris left on the beach by ORV users, particularly at points in the year where ORV traffic is high, destroy the beauty of the beach for those, like me, who love to walk in the special natural beauty of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I am fortunate enough to own a beach house in Salvo, and I spend about three months there in total each year from early September through late May. Every time I go over the dunes to walk or sit on the beach when ORVs are permitted to drive on the beach in front of my property, I am sickened by the thought of what they are doing to wildlife habitats and the rutted mess they make of the beach. I have personally seen them drive up on the base of the dunes, moving up and down the dunes for the sheer thrill of it. We are fortunate enough to have a new line of dunes forming on the ocean side in front of the current dunes. The ORV users show little regard for these forming dunes, with the resultant damage retarding their formation and growth.

You cannot tell me that ORV access is necessary for fishermen to get where they want to go when I see responsible fishermen carrying their tackle, chairs, food, and drinks over the dunes. I carry what I need for an enjoyable outing on the beach. Why can't

they when so much is at stake?

In my view, the arguments of ORV users to preserve their ability to drive on the beach and the local residents who so stridently support them because of economic reasons simply do not outweigh the impact on wildlife. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a treasure that belongs to all citizens of the United States. I just want to make clear that all who own property there are NOT in favor of continued ORV access to the beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12604    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12605    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

It sadden me to know that you are giving in to a profit hungry America that only considers money and not the important values of life. Please reconsider. Living things do more to protect our environment than greedy perons.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12606    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the

Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12607    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12608    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12609    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir or Madam,

As a lover of shore birds and beaches, I feel compelled to reach out and express my concern for the protection of shoreline wildlife affected by off road vehicles. Nesting birds and native animals have no protection from motorized vehicles that terrorize their habitat. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Sincerely,

Lori T. Brown 325 East Waukegan Avenue Milwaukee, WI 53207

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12610    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened

and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12611	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed.						

I am opposed to unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife. Please do not approve any such regulatory changes.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12612	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thank you for the chance to express my opinion on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The current management plan at the Seashore has been a huge success! Sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have been able to return to their natural territory. I find it appalling that the proposed new regulation treats wildlife protection as a not very important, optional matter: provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches; and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach which will unavoidably made these areas undesirable to pedestrians and detrimental to wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12613	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.						

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-

ORV users and wildlife.

Thank you for considering these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12614    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

Also, as Hurricane Irene demonstrated, storms can be quite dangerous. Natural vegetation helps beach erosion and needs to be maintained in a healthy state. Use of ORV's can certainly destroy vegetation if they are used in sensitive areas.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12615    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12616    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** # I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12617    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** IN ADDITION TO THE COMMENTS BELOW ... I witnessed the killing of a 4 year old, as he giggled with delight at being on the beach and was run over by a big, red truck who had been "cruising" the beach for hours! Disgusting policy" I appreciate the



opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12618    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12619    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12620    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please support our environment and limit off road driving in the very delicate Outer Banks, NC. Wildlife has been decimated over the last 10 years due to disruption and destruction of nesting sites and required domain.

Thank you,

Wm M Keyser

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12621    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thanks for the opportunity to voice my opinion. I like to hunt,fish,camp and four wheel. i do not want that to stop but I also feel I need to fit into my surroundings. The wildlife here in North Caroline is unique from the mountings to the coast. THEY WERE

HERE FIRST. I want them here when i am gone so others can enjoy them. Nature needs a balance to survive and it is up to man to make sure the balance is kept. I have looked at the map and symbols of where the nesting sights are and where I can go to enjoy the Outer Banks. I think for the time being it should be kept as it is. If in the future it needs to be restricted more then we need to keep the balance ON the wildlife side that we need to protect and respect. THEY WERE HERE FIRST.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12622    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We are alarmed by off-road vehicles riding rampant over beaches that are the nesting grounds of endangered wildlife at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, among other places. Please take steps to control these damaging vehicles in sensitive places! Nelda B. and Gilford Ikenberry

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12623    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12624    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Lee F. Dougherty

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12625    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a

natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12626    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12627    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We don't need to use motorized vehicles to survive. The wildlife does need us to STOP destroying their homes and nesting areas so that THEY MAY SURVIVE. How about we stop being selfish for once!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12628    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please help us save the nesting sites of these precious

birds so our children and grandchildren can learn to love

and appreciate the beauties of these wild creatures!

We must not let mankind or his pets run rampant over

delicate nesting sites.

Save the birds!

Elaine Andersen

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12629    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few

areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12630    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12631    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12632    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We must do everything in our power to protect wildlife. Do not allow off road vehicles to destroy our beaches further endangering sea turtles and other animals.

Do all you can.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12633    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** You can't have it both ways... either a preserve is for the animals and wildlife for which it was developed to protect or is becomes a road or a housing development. allowing off road vehicles to run rampant on wildlife preserves is destructive to the wildlife and defeats the purpose of the preserve 100% of the time. There is no room for tolerance or to wiggle. Off road vehicles are useless destructive, aggressive, pointless, energy inefficient and a profligate obscene waste of our resources to the benefit of a very few... greedy fools. They should be banned period end of report

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12634    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please prevent off road vehicles from endangering our wildlife. All nature is connected and important to our environment. Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 12635    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12636    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

The nationally protected seashores not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act. To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

Thank you for considering these comments and for the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations.

**Correspondence ID:** 12637    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12638    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** save the birds

**Correspondence ID:** 12639    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

i live close to canaveral national seashore in florida and truly enjoy the serene beauty of that beach. i am also constantly amazed at how many seabirds and turtle nests there are. it would be very sad if i had to listen to and possibly get run over by off road vehicles while trying to enjoy a peaceful day at the beach. please consider this when making your decision.

**Correspondence ID:** 12640    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am VERY concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Park Service plan is more about protecting beach drivers, and not the endangered wildlife that will be impacted. The wildlife is part of what makes this place so special. Please show that you have the courage to stand up for the environment. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

**Correspondence ID:** 12641    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** There are certain places where wild should remain wild and that means that man should not interfere with any of his toys. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is just such a place. Please keep it wild and free.

**Correspondence ID:** 12642    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** My grandmother lived in Raleigh and I have fond memories of the North Carolina shore and its wilodlife. Please don't let it be destroyed by vehicles running over nesting birds and turtles.

**Correspondence ID:** 12643    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I think the only way for humans to live in harmony on this planet is to find ways to, precisely, work our needs around the land and animals we live in and with. We are the one species capable of producing better ideas and ways of fulfilling various needs, but in order to do so, we must also keep our morals in check, and circumvent what appears to be an already chaotic race towards the destruction of everything we touch, and quite possibly our own selves.

This is not a time to create more problems, but rather to solve them, even if that means going out of our way to protect all species and their habitat. As "governors of the planet", it is quite simply our duty to help other creates as much as, if not more than, we help ourselves. And if someone needs to park a little further away from the shores in order to protect a species, they ought to feel proud of doing so.

Sincerely, A Very Concerned Citizen of the World.

**Correspondence ID:** 12644    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12645	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Designated ORV vehicular space does not protect wildlife that lie in the path of them.						

The new regulation needs to protect wildlife such as sea turtles from them

Noise levels are also a concern for nesting as well.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12646	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12647	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Colleen McNicoll

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12648    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12649    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Keep it natural!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12650    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12651    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not



continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for giving me an opportunity to express my concern regarding this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12652    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I object to the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I believe a National Seashore should be a natural, vehicle-free area.

National Parks are to set apart to be treasured and protected from wanton desecration. Off Road vehicle use should not be considered.

If exclusion of ORV's is not possible at this point please include wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12653    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please help the rare birds and sea turtles that nest on these beaches - There are less and less places for animals to survive with so much over development - and poor decision making.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12654    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Jane Branyan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12655    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12656    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I'm writing to encourage the National Park Service to use the management techniques that have allowed the sea turtles and beach nesting birds on Cape Hatteras to recover the last few years on their long term management plan. I enjoy going to birding destinations and the cape is on my list to visit. I believe that a vehicle free beach would greatly enhance my experience as well as many other people and families. Thank you for considering my input.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12657    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am strongly OPPOSED to off-road motor vehicle use at any of MY National Seashores.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12658    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We are opposed to off road vehicles on any seashore that is nesting ground for plovers or any other bird life. Further, we are opposed to human destruction of any sea shores where sea turtles or seals or any other animals lay eggs, rest or reproduce. Mankind must take stewardship for other forms of life, and for wild and natural places as well.

Give humans an inch and they will take a mile... protect the birds, protect the shore, and leave the noise, fumes, and vehicular and human waste to the cities.

We beg you on behalf of all life forms,

Ted Essex and Fran Essex, Ethologist

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12659    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12660    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect wildlife nesting areas in our National Park System: Cape Hatteras National Seashore. This is an extremely valuable beach both in terms of wildlife nesting and tourist revenue. People who come to the beach, tend to enjoy the sound/presence of seabirds and a more natural pristine environment. Unrestricted off road vehicle access seriously threatens shorebirds, sea turtles and damages beaches. Often off road vehicles leave litter. Our beaches are fragile and valuable and should not be used as roadways or parking lots. Beaches are expensive to restore. Please maintain/expand restricted areas for off road vehicles.

Thank you, Elizabeth Craig

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12661    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am so concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

As a long time Virginia resident, I have often vacationed on the Outer Banks and have brought family and friends with me. As first Naghead, then Duck became too crowded for me, Hatteras and Ocracoke became my favorite vacation and get away locations, bringing me great pleasure and adding a fair amount of cash into your economy as well.

Always, the unspoiled areas and the wonderful wildlife brought me back. Under your current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12662	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing to express my deep disapproval of this proposed regulation to sets aside areas for ORVs at Cape Hatteras National Seashore with out specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. This piece of public land, for which my tax dollars help support, is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year who go there for the natural beauty, the amazing wildlife diversity and 67 miles of pristine shoreline. The impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use will devastate these qualities of this gem in the our national public land system, taken a toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches, as well as destroying the quality of the experience for the rest of the park's visitors. If ORVs are going to be continued to allowed to use the park then there needs to be enforceable rules/restrictions that are based on sound science and not politics to protect wildlife and the natural beauty of the place.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12663	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12664	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened

and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12665	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am sorely disappointed by your proposed regulations of ORV's on Cape Hatteras. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12666	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Save the nesting shore birds and others.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12667	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12668	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12669    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12670    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12671    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** When will we stop desecrating the earth and all living things on it. Wildlife has no voice other than people like you and me and we must do right by them

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12672    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I volunteer weekly at the Lindsay Wildlife Museum Hospital & know first-hand the impact of policy upon nesting birds. ORV owners have ample areas to operate and need not desecrate our National Seashore and destroy nesting habitat.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12673    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** For crying outloud. Don't let the ORV wildly mow down defenseless birds. Make restrictions that are sensible. Make restrictions that let ORV's have their fun, but protect the wildlife.

Think before making restrictions that will benefit as well as protect.....please!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12674    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12675    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12676    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12677    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12678    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12679    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

I've been to most of the world's oceans and many of its beaches.

All I can say is that there are plenty of people - unfit, unaware, and full of themselves - driving beaches, and that there are dedicated ORV areas, but of course with their sense of entitlement would not stoop to use, but...

there are only so many beaches, each under slaughter from so many quarters.

I know which I favor! Please let people know what an intact beach is. Besides sand walking is so darn good for you.

Use this time you are spending to organize plastic pickups and trawling, perhaps?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12680    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12681    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12682    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12683    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I have experienced the thrill of seeing piping plovers in their protected areas on Cape Cod and hope others interested in wildlife have the same opportunity. The wildlife which nests on beaches deserve a place for their survival. Our National Seashores need to be a resource for everyone, and must continue to be a habitat for the creatures that cannot survive without vehicle-free buffers during their breeding cycles.

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for people like myself who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12684    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov



**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12685    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12686    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** This whole process has been a sham. Allowing Environmentalist to sue park service over beach closure should not be allowed.

Points of Contention to the rules are:

1) No areas should be completely closed because of birds or turtles. The park should use drive thru areas like the ones used at Cape Lookout National Seashore. Thereby allowing the public Access to their beaches. Especially the Spits and Cape Point.

2) No scientific facts for closing the beach at night. The beach should be open for Orv use 24/7/ 365

3) no fee should be charged for using the park beaches

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12687    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please keep Cape Hatteras ecosystem natural. Don't permit motor vehicles to invade its beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12688    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12689    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12690    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** BEACHES ARE MEANT TO BE WALKED ON NOT DRIVEN OVER & DESTROYING THE NATURAL BEAUTY & THE TREASURED CREATURES OF OUR ENVIRONMENT!!! OBVIOUSLY, WE MUST NOT LET OUR WORLD BE DESTROYED BY THOSE WHO DO NOT THINK CLEARLY OR FAIRLY!!

IT IS TIME TO LISTEN TO & SUPPORT THE RIGHTS OF THE CLEAR-THINKING SENSIBLE AMERICAN CITIZEN & SAVE OUR LANDS AND ANIMALS FROM BEING HEARTLESSLY USED & THOUGHTLESSLY !!!DESTROYED

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12691    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153.

Please expand your protection areas to give the wildlife the protection it deserves!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12692    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Any thing that will preserve nature is preferred.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12693    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such

as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

My wife and I have been to Cape Hatteras and enjoy visiting national parks, NWR' and other federally protected areas. Preservation of wildlife and their habitat is very important to us and a key mission of both National and local Audubon chapters.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12694    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12695    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12696    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As a frequent resident of coastal North Carolina and one who possesses a love of the Outer Banks and nearby beaches and dunes, I feel that all ATV's should be banned from the area. The negative effects upon wildlife, sea birds, endangered sea turtles, public safety and the integrity of the environment negates any possible arguments for permitting their use on National Park Lands anywhere.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12697    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed.

This proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number

rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. Please take this seriously and act responsibly for wildlife. Human activity does so much damage to wildlife and habitat; this one small action is not so much to ask.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12698    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12699    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It's really simply, motorized vehicles and wildlife don't mix well. And the problem is that there are too many areas in which motorized vehicles are allowed and not enough for wildlife to survive.

So, please protect fragile wildlife areas by not allowing motorized vehicles to disturb it's natural beauty. We need to think about tomorrow not only about today. Future generations need to be able to experience natural wildlife areas just as we can still do it.

Do we humans really ave to destroy everything on this earth?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12700    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles need to be kept out of these fragile areas where nesting birds are trying to raise their young. Recreational vehicles should not be allowed in these fragile habitats. It isn't fair to let these off road vehicles ruin the solitude and beauty of these areas for the wildlife, of for the people who want to enjoy these natural areas as they should be. Please keep vehicles out of these areas and off of these roads!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12701    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** For heavens sake, vehicles should not be aloud on our beaches; they only kill sea turtles, terns - and make people fatter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12702    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12703    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering

shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12704    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I oppose any off-road vehicles on beaches as damaging to wildlife and obnoxious to humans.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12705    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** You have an obligation to protect our wildlife. Please do so . What we've been given on this earth, in this life, is very precious and rapidly disappearing. We need to protect it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12706    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** What a terrible idea.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12707    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I live near South Padre Island where they also have private citizens joy riding on the beach. They can walk or ride horses. Haven't humans invaded enough of our wildlands?

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12708    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We must protect and sustain all of our national parks and all wildlife therein. If we don't protect our environment, our environment can't protect us.

Your own compassion is measured by how you behave toward those who are most vulnerable.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12709    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As a former North Carolina resident, a lifelong birder, and a frequent visitor to the Outer Banks, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current management plan, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am extremely concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. Regulation of ORVs within the Seashore must include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians.

The regulation will protect the species that depend on the Seashore only if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12710    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for accepting my comments about the proposed National Park Service (NPS) regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current management plan, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback; however, it seems that the proposed regulation makes protection optional. Why undo all the good that has been done?

Further, it makes no sense to cater to a few ORV users at the expense of families that need beaches free of the dangers these vehicles pose.

Let these people take their vehicles - dangerous to wildlife and people both - somewhere else. They don't NEED these beaches nearly as much as families with kids and the indigenous wildlife.

Specific, enforceable, science-based protections are vital for for the wildlife that lives there and the pedestrians who visit. The NPS management plan should set aside additional areas for those uses, and very few for these ORVs, IF ANY AT ALL.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thanks again for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12711    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12712    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include

specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12713	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12714	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

We need to keep our country environmentally safe for everyone.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12715	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We must treat wildlife with care and respect. This isn't me saying it- this command comes from God.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12716	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As a many decade visitor to the outer banks and past cottage owner, I was disappointed that there is conflict with us humans and the wonderful natural resource and wildlife at Hatteras that many of us have enjoyed. I remember tern nest area that were fenced off during the nesting season and had hoped more protection would be in place now.						

Therefore,I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a

natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12717    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We must protect and sustain all of our national parks and all wildlife therein. If we don't protect our environment, our environment can't protect us.

Your own compassion is measured by how you behave toward those who are most vulnerable.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12718    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Our beaches and shore line must be protected from motor vehicles driving on them. Our environment is being attacked from so many directions; prohibiting driving on our beaches and shoreline shouldn't be hard if we make it a no no.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12719    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12720    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comment

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12721    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few



areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12722    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and spe

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12723    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12724    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the

beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12725    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I support specific , enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12726    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I have worked with endangered shorebirds such as Piping Plovers and Least Terns in both CT and ME. I know how susceptible these birds are to disturbance. Nest failure is high in areas without some type of buffer or protective barrier.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12727    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I used to live on Long Island and also used to drive on the beaches but was aware of the need to protect the seabirds and wildlife at the beach. Long Island beaches had non-driving buffers (fences) around the protected bird and wildlife areas. I see no reason why protections can't be put in place at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12728    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few

areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12729    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12730    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles disturb the peace and kill wildlife. There is no place for them in our parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12731    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12732    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12733    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12734    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12735    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Years ago, before off-road vehicles became the norm, we vacationed on Ocracoke Island nearly every year. The beaches then were loaded with ghost crabs and other fauna that used the beaches for home. When we return now it makes us sick to think how many shore animals have vanished, and are replaced with hundreds of cars and thousands of people that are too lazy to carry there items to the beach from the road. PLEASE KEEP OFF-ROAD VEHICLES OFF THE NATIONAL PARK BEECHES.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12736    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** There are many reps.of the "canary in a coal mine" that we need to protect.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12737    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do all you can to protect our Wildlife! Off-road vehicles should not be permitted if wildlife is threatened by them and the general public should be warned to keep vehicles away from such areas. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12738    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12739    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I support Defenders of Wildlife statement on behalf of offshore wildlife. Please, take the maximum action you can to restrict traffic to protect them. Thanks, Peter Ember

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12740    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** There's no good reason I can think of for permitting off-road vehicles unfettered access in areas where wildlife naturally exists. Please do not allow this to happen at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, or anywhere you have jurisdiction.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12741    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to make my comment to you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12742    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America. It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other

hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. Please reinstate these protections. I hope to visit Cape Hatteras someday soon and witness the wild environment firsthand, and want it to be there for my children and grandchildren as well!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12743    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Stop off road vehicles from killing wildlife and their habitats.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12744    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Once the wildlife on our beaches is gone it will never return. It is our responsibility to safeguard the habitat of themany diffeent types of wildlife that call our water and beaches home.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12745    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Leslie Babson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12746    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** In regards to rules governing Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I would like the NPS to implement rules that restrict ORV and allow those of us who go there to enjoy a little peace and quiet. I would also like to see the many shorebirds and turtles given protection from these vehicles. The presence of these vehicles, I believe, ruins the park experience for the majority of people. Their presence is incompatible with the concept of a park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12747    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I wish to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. As a Sea Turtle Patrol volunteer in a coastal community, I know firsthand how even pedestrian traffic can be detrimental to the welfare of wildlife on the beach.

Therefore, I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the

exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. Please do not allow this!

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state.

Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12748	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12749	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12750	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As an avid bird lover and user of National Parks, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such

as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12751    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12752    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12753    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** All-terrain vehicles, trucks, jeeps and SUVs should not be allowed on beaches except for emergency purposes only. Beach habitat is fragile and already overused and abused by humans via pollution, off-shore toxic waste, and regular visitors leaving their trash. This is a minimal effort to help maintain what is left of our wonderful beaches and the flora and fauna that live there and help protect our inland waterways and cities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12754    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I welcome the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such



as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12755    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** keep ORV off our beaches, they have all the rest of the world to race around and cause damage. I've never seen any of these people clean up after themselves so it will help with pollution and littering as well.

It's a good idea, it's the best Idea. Please do the Right Thing for The Right Reasons. What an opportunity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12756    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12757    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing Off Road Vehicle use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12758    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sir/Madam:

I frequent shorelines and appreciate the shorebirds and turtle nesting areas. Protecting these gifts are more urgent than ORV access.

Please do all you can to protect the habitats for birds and turtles.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12759    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Unrestricted access by off road vehicles are threatening shorebirds and turtles. Human amusement shouldn't be allowed to kill native and threatened wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12760    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

Just as with every national park, ORVs create pollution and noise for visitors who would like to see the wildlife and enjoy the environment without annoyance from those with no concern for anyone but themselves.

We visited Cape Hatteras last year as part of a birding trip around all the costs of the US. Killing birds doesn't help encourage visitors like us.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12761    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am deeply opposed to any change in regulations, or any failure to properly regulate, that will damage the unique habitat of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Given the increasingly violent storm systems impacting this area, all due care must be taken to repair damage caused by natural disasters, and prevent degradation of this important natural buffer zone which acts as a buffer against storm surges and winds which would then cause even more damage to residential and business areas beyond the beaches and estuaries.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12762    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12763    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I recently visited a wild life refuge in Rhode Island. It was so pleasant not to have vehicles buzzing around. The birds

andwildlife were abundant. all refuges should be like that

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12764    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Brian Larson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12765    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12766    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12767    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** When formulating policies for seashores and any NATURAL are, ORV access should be at least minimized or ELIMINATED, if such areas are to be considered NATURAL areas. All motorized vehicles emit exhaust and drip petroleum contaminants, and therefore are clearly inconsistent with a definition of NATURAL area.

Please appreciate the quality of an area, and the experience of those who choose to visit such areas without motorized means, perhaps excepting ONLY those with bona fide disabilities.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12768    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please don't allow vehicles on the beaches of Cape Hatteras.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12769    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Humans will use up and destroy everything on earth if not given restrictions. Unfortunately, we are not always capable of self-regulation and must often be told what to do. Preserving the environment and our wildlife is one of the things that does not come naturally to us. We need education and laws that are enforceable.

Given free reign, we will decimate every usable resource and life form. The average person needs to be told what to do, and this is no exception. I live on a lake and have seen an astonishing decline in the waterfowl in just this last year. Some species have not been seen in several years. To think that it does not affect us in some way is folly.

Please help those who are not able to think beyond a selfish moment's pleasure.

Thank you,

Hannah Hurvitz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12770    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It is absolutely essential for sea life and bird life that the sea and sea shore is kept without development and pollution.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12771    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12772    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE do not allow ORVs on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore!

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the

beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12773    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12774    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

PLEASE do not allow the use of ORVs on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12775    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12776    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As someone who has enjoyed this area in the past, I feel it would be very harmful to ease any protections of this beautiful area. I would hope that all care is taken to preserve and protect this national and natural beauty.

**Correspondence ID:** 12777    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

**Correspondence ID:** 12778    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I am a lifetime visitor to the outer banks of NC and a North Carolina native. These outlying areas are remarkably precious to many travelers from around the country who make their own migrations to enjoy and observe unspoiled seashore and its inhabitants.

**Correspondence ID:** 12779    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

Even though I live on the other side of the country, I am writing to ask for your revision of proposed regulations for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable.

Whether in our northwest forests, or the eastern coastlands, giving priority to off-road vehicles is wrong. It's September 2011, the environment is challenged on every front, and wild creatures struggle to endure all around the world. From the air to the sea and everywhere between, we are called to make corrections, such as the current interim plan, under which protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does

wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12780    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I personally cannot understand why ANY vehicles, except occasionally emergency/official vehicles, are allowed to roam our beaches. I think the damage these vehicles do to the land, vegetation and especially the wildlife is not worth allowing vehicles on the beaches. It's simply not worth it. Sincerely, Toby J. Savoie

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12781    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12782    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The unrestricted use of off-road vehicles degrade our parks by causing erosion and disturb wildlife other park users with their noise. They should not be permitted in places and at times when erosion is likely, and muffler specifications should be made more stringent. There is no legitimate reason for the exhaust of an ATV or a snowmobile to be noisier than a family sedan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12783    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The plan presented to protect the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is inadequate for protection of the area and the wildlife.....

PLEASE insist on strengthening this plan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12784    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12785    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback from declines caused largely by ORV use..

I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. Birds and turtles belong on the beaches; ORVs don't.

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as large non-driving buffers around nests. Please add such buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore; better yet, banish the ORVs altogether.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12786    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12787    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

Off-Road Vehicles are very destructive to bird habitat. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12788    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private



**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12789    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please exert your strongest effort to protect Seashore wildlife. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12790    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off Road Vehicle users represent a small portion of the population who rely on the preservation of the scenery and security of wildlife in a fragile environment. This small group should not be allowed to destroy our heritage of nature for the rest of society. I realize that this group does have rights, and should be allowed to access areas which allow them to enjoy whatever it is they enjoy. Please limit the areas they are allowed to go so that they don't ruin it for others and for the nesting birds, etc.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12791    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am taking the time to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. They are not the only citizens to use these areas, others who respect and appreciate the flora and fauna of the area do use the parks as well. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12792    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12793    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Our national seashores protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, and represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments. It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources by increasing hazards for pedestrian visitors, and increasing wildlife mortality and dwindling their populations. Also, wildlife protections do work. Tthe Park Service has omitted buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12794    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12795    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Off-road vehicles (and the people who drive them) undoubtedly have a place in our world. Tearing up and down National Seashores (obviously an activity, rather than a "place") is not one of them. We have more than enough mindless destruction.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12796    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** It is not enough to set aside a small percentage of the beach area for pedestrians. Please protect vital nesting areas from off road vehicles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12797    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12798    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Dennis Heinzig

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12799	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Save our shore birds. The planet needs them not off road vehicles.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12800	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thank you for the chance and the space to provide a public comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12801	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thank you very much for helping to protect one of the Atlantic's last wild seashores! Sea turtles, nesting shorebirds, and future generations of Americans will be grateful for your action.						

God expects protection and care for our wildlife and the environment.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12802	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Recreational use of national lands in any biologically sensitive area must be carefully monitored. In this instance, allowing off-road vehicles unrestricted access at Cape Hatteras National Seashore threatens several species and their breeding/nesting grounds. Let's use our resources responsibly. There are other, less sensitive areas that these users can enjoy.						

I am a participant in off-road activities and cannot support this regulation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12803    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** yes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12804    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for letting us comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Recently, sea turtles and beach nesting birds have made a real comeback. However, I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12805    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the chance to comment on your proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Atlantic coast national seashores are the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach in the eastern US. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but are the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments.

ORV noise, pollution and dust prevents enjoyment of the park. The well-documented impairment of park resources by ORV use also includes diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. In contrast, when the Park Service enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds protected species rebounded, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in the last season prior to the plan's implementation.

Unconscionably, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short of its obligations under the Organic Act. To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

The regulation also fails to set aside adequate vehicle-free areas and prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then at least half of the beach must be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

Thank you for considering these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12806    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Why do the off road folks have to ruin the world for the rest of the world. The animals were there much before the off road folks. If they must ride their machines, why don't they build special places just for them. Let them put up some money and time for that. I don't need them on public land taking, taking, and taking what is not theirs to take.

Respectfully Connie Campbell

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12807    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12808    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I sm for strict regulation of ORVs in the Cspe Hatteras National Park. It Is vital to the protection of all the species of birds, turtles,etc., some of which are endangered. I live on a barrier island where hundreds of loggerhead turtles come to lay their eggs. It takes strict regulations to ensure the maximum number of baby turtles make it to the sea after they hatch.

Please consider the plight of this and all other species of animals when you write up the regulations for this park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12809    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed regulations that will control what happens at Cape Hatteras for decades and set a precedent for other national parks. A balanced plan would guarantee adequate space and protections for wildlife, while still allowing responsible beach driving in some areas so that all visitors can fully enjoy this national treasure. As written, the proposed regulation does not mandate specific, science-based protections for the wildlife that depends on the Seashore. In fact, it protects ONLY the rights of off-road vehicle users to drive on large areas of the beach to the exclusion of wildlife, it treats wildlife protection as optional, and it provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches.

I support management of the national parks that safeguard wildlife from off-road driving and balances the needs of all user groups.

Thank you for your consideration to this matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12810    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Which is more important in short AND the long term?

joy rides on of -road vehicles - or - a species, like turtles?

Which has the highest value?

Don't you think it's appalling even to ask this question? That it's necessary to ask reflects how jaded, nay, corrupted our values have become.

Adults - not adolescents - but adults, protect what is precious. Because experience has taught them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12811    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12812    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow off road vehicles on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Your duty is to protect this area, not to commercialize it. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12813    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off-roaders are killing the fragile shoreline environment and wildlife habitat. Off-roaders are NOT entitled this type of destruction.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12814    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12815    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE HELP

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12816    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please officially record that I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I am opposed to unrestricted off-road vehicle at the site.

The NPS proposed regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras do not adequately protect wildlife nesting areas. The proposal merely sets aside areas for ORV's but does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

The park is a national treasure : natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12817    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Why do people feel it necessary to add vehicles to pristine wildlife areas? When these animals are gone, they will never come back in our lifetime. We must protect the area and ban any vehicle from the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12818    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12819    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

ORVs are no longer acceptable with our need to reduce oil use, improve air, soil, and water quality, and fight obesity and lack of fitness in our citizens.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12820    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12821    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12822    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12823    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Ban vehicles on beaches during nesting season.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12824    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12825    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I go to the beach, and our National Parks, to get away from the noise and pollution of our modern world. I would bann ORV's entirely from our National Parks. If we cannot do that, then the use of ORV's should be severely limited.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape



Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

I

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12826    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The beaches should absolutely be off limits to "off road vehicles". I would ban them altogether. Roads are enough intrusion into wildlife habitat already.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12827    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Sincerely, Amy Gregg

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12828    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** it's imperative wildlife continue to have the benefit of legal protections.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12829    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12830    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your

consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12831    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As a supporter of the National Audubon Society, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12832    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12833    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Off Road Vehicle Use at Cape Hatteras National Park. I live many miles away and I have always dreamed of visiting Cape Hatteras National Park in honor of my Aunt who lived in North Carolina.

I understand the current ORV management plan has protected wildlife and sea turtles, piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. I am a birdwatcher and will visit the Park to view wildlife and the birds. There are many tourists who travel to an area to view the wildlife and wild birds.

I urge you to continue the plan which has protected the wildlife and protects the seashore from Off The Road Vehicles who destroy the beach, without realizing their impacts.

I urge you to put into the plan more vehicle -free areas for wildlife and visitors to the park. More miles of beach assist wildlife and protects them from harm. More miles of ORV free beach will be good for beach combers and visitors who wish to enjoy the scenery and the life at the beach. Free from the noise, exhaust and danger of the Off The Road Vehicle enthusiasts. Please adopt the plan which allows for more miles of ORV free beaches to protect the wildlife and ensures visitors freedom from ORV noise; include the current buffers and the other protections for wildlife that rely on the Cape Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your attention and consideration. Sincerely, Carla Thomas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12834    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Thank you for protecting wildlife in our parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12835    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12836    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12837    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12838    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off trail vehicles and other motorized vehicles destroy many species of animals and vegetation. It is irresponsible to allow this to continue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12839    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12840    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I oppose ORV use in all National Seashores. The majority of us (visitors) go to enjoy the natural setting and wildlife.

Thank you for the chance to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12841    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Please stop this senseless killing of wildlife!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12842    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** We know that these people love having a place to run with their ATVs.... and maybe they should have a place to do this.. but PLEASE...PLEASE....PLEASE....PLEASE.....PLEASE Do Not Let Them Destroy the most important areas where we are trying to protect the wildlife, turtles, seabirds... PLEASE... make sure that families can enjoy safe and free beaches without the off-road vehicle traffic... PLEASE... make sure that you have an important and specific mandate for the protection of this area and its wildlife. PLEASE.. understand that we support management by the National Park Service... I don't believe that the off-road people want to enjoy the view of Cape Hattasrras..... they want to play in the sand that will ultimately destroy the area. PLEASE... PLEASE.....PLEASE.....PLEASE.

DO THE RIGHT THING.... GLORIA LOWERY

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12843    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** As a bird watcher and a walker, I am always dismayed and horrified to encounter motorized vehicles on the beach. Sadly, cars and trucks are still allowed on the Coast of Washington State, where they terrorize walkers and birds, and I consider this to be an anachronism. The damage to the beach is considerable and the noise rents the peace of the place.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. Beaches are not an appropriate place for "recreational" ORV users.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12844    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I have watched with interest all of the meetings and negotiations regarding beach closures to protect wildlife on Cape Hatteras. The increase of nesting birds and turtles has been wonderful to see these last few years and I would like to see beach restrictions continue to support wildlife and make the beaches more enjoyable for pedestrians.

Therefore, I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12845    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Sincerely, Cindy Grimes

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12846    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Our wildlife and natural environment are priceless and even more important now because human activity is destroying them. The health of humans is dependent on the health of the earth: we need to do all we can to protect the animals and eco-systems. All life depends on it.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12847    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12848    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am disturbed by the proposed regulations for ORV use on Cape Hatteras Nat'l Seashore. ORV drivers are a small minority of those who use the seashore. Some of us use the seashore for rest, the pleasure of being with nature, and being in a quiet place. Others rely on the seashore, quite literally, for their lives and the future of their various species.

The Park Service plan provides more for a small minority of users, ORVs, than for the rest of us, and certainly far less for nature than for vehicles.

Please reconsider your plan to provide for current buffers and explicit protection plans for wildlife and for the people who love this seashore - without the sound and destruction of ORVs.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12849    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12850    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect the beach nesting birds by regulating threats to their environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12851    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include

specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12852    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12853    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Gosia Mitros

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12854    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the

Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards, Bryan Vandrovec

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12855    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Greetings,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I and others are very concerned the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, providing few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favoring the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Personally, I will not come and visit this area if there is extensive ORV use. While I am only one person, I believe there are many other like minded people. As wildlife enthusiasts we bring millions of dollars to local economies. We come for the wildlife, for nature - not for the disruption caused by ORVs. Please consider protecting what is truly important.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Thank you, Michelle Michaud

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12856    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12857    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not



continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12858    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Michael, Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.

Finally, after years of advocacy and litigation by Defenders and our partners, the National Park Service is poised to adopt regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Yet the proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas. The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving. In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife. In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline. All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over. We have made great progress in winning important protections for Hatteras' wildlife, and we can't lose traction now. ORV advocates want the entire seashore open to beach driving. Tell the Park Service instead that you support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12859    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

I know up in Massachusetts and New Hampshire there are areas for plover nesting, and that has been tremendous in helping these birds survive, and in helping the overall ecosystem not be overrun by ATV's and litter.

Please consider making this more than just something that looks good on paper.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12860    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12861    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12862    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the I I I wish to comment on proposed regulations regarding Cape Hatteras Park. The regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and

for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12863    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

The National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a matter of deep concern to me.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12864    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife.

Wildlife must be explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan. I support, and as a voter demand, specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving. I want to see no ORV and all 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, the way it should be!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12865    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does

wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12866    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** To Park Service Representatives: Please consider putting some restrictions on off road vehicle use on Hatteras beaches for the protection of OUR wildlife; otherwise we will continue on the path of all wildlife extinction. Both sides win with compromise. Thank you for reading my comment. Sincerely, Susan Schena

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12867    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12868    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I live on a shoreline and see the seabirds.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12869    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12870    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12871    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I strongly support the idea of limiting ORV use on Cape Hatteras Nat'l Seashore to protect the birds that use it for both nesting and living. ORVs are noisy, often destructive, and take away from a pleasant day at the beach. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12872    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12873    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12874    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** deAR sIRS, tHOUGH cAPE hATTERAS IS A FAR PIECE FROM OREGON, I think you should be aware that in Oregon we have tried to protect shorebirds, in particular, the snowy plover, by creating small protected enclosures for them. We do not permit off road vehicles on the beaches at nesting time and are particularly careful about rich shorebird areas like Bandon Rocks, Oregon. I hope that Cape Hatteras birds can share in the protection of habitat afforded by our state. Thank you for your

careful consideration. Jean Hanna

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12875    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Rather than weakening the existing regulations, they should be strengthened. By weakening the rules the NPS is caving into a loud minority (ORV users). The people and wildlife that visit and live with the Cape Hatteras National Seashore deserve better.

I first saw the Cape Hatteras lighthouse and the surrounding miles of unobstructed beach on the Cape in 1958. Beach buggies were present in the form of old cars used back, mostly by surf fishermen. They were not particularly obtrusive. I never envisioned these vehicles proliferating the way they have or them being used fishermen other than to put up and down the beach. Times have changed, but the needs of the extant wildlife have not. A National Seashore should not be turned into a recreation area for ORVs at the expense of the wildlife that depends on these marvelous nature areas.

As a sea turtle biologist who works in Florida, I've had to deal with ORV user groups. They tend to be mostly loud and obnoxious, which ruins it for those whose approach to ORV use is more measured. For the NPS to roll over and lower the bar regarding ORV use to a dereliction of its charge as an agency that is supposed to protect wildlife and its habitat. If you can't do anything else at least keep the existing regulations in place.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12876    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12877    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We have the responsibility to preserve and protect our wilderness and its wildlife. Anything that needs to be done to do this must be done. As it stands now we are persecuting NOT protecting in many instances. We need to stand up for those who can't speak for themselves.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12878    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We must PROTECT our Shore Birds. Cape Hatteras National Seashore is home to many beautiful birds. We must stop off road destruction of these birds!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12879    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-

based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12880    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12881    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12882    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. Do the right thing,for once.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12883    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12884    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I write today to urge that the strongest science-based protections be permanently put in place at Cape Hatteras National Seashore to ensure that shorebirds, turtles and all other wildlife that depend on this beautiful area for their very lives and reproduction. It is imperative that those who wish to drive their off road vehicles do so in areas other than this fragile seashore. Please do the right thing and protect these wonderful animals from more human devastation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12885    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

The Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12886    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Please help protect Sea turtles and other animals and there nests. Continuing to expand will kill these animals and hurt their environment.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and

pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12887    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches. Finally, after years of advocacy and litigation by Defenders and our partners, the National Park Service is poised to adopt regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Yet the proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over.

We have made great progress in winning important protections for Hatteras' wildlife, and we can't lose traction now. ORV advocates want the entire seashore open to beach driving. I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12888    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please give this National Park & the wildlife who live there the maximum protection.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12889    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** it's vitally important that endangered wildlife and their habitats have the benefit of legal protections.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12890    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect threatened species like the piping plover and other shorebirds. ORVs should not be allowed on land along the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you for considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12891    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.



The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12892    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12893    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12894    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As beachfront property owners and Florida residents, my husband, Roy A. Walters, and I support the utmost protection for seabirds, turtles and other wildlife. We have been to Cape Hatteras and we enjoyed its vastly unspoiled network of pristine areas. To give precedence to motor vehicles over wildlife, or to even consider both issues of equal importance, is wrong. We oppose motor vehicles on the beaches of Florida and we oppose motor vehicle access to the Outer Banks, as well.

As beachfront property owners and Florida residents, my husband, Roy A. Walters, and I support the utmost protection for seabirds, turtles and other wildlife. We have been to Cape Hatteras and we enjoyed its vastly unspoiled network of pristine areas. To give precedence to motor vehicles over wildlife, or to even consider both issues of equal importance, is wrong. We oppose motor vehicles on the beaches of Florida and we oppose motor vehicle access to the Outer Banks, as well.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12895    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include

specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12896    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12897    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I wanted to add to a comment expressed yesterday. In a world that needs to cut back on its fossil fuel consumption we need to provide recreation that does not involve cars and motorized vehicles. Having places that involve walking set aside without the worry of pedestrian encounters with noisy vehicles has to be addressed. The places for peace and quiet in natural surroundings continues to shrink and there is no provision for these needs in these regulations being discussed. I have also found that many people who enjoy ORV recreation are not always responsible if things are not spelled out exactly about ORV usage. Pedestrians are also not always responsible either so for wildlife's sake this need to be addressed also.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12898    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** KEEP VEHICLES OFF THE BEACHES. IT'S NOT NECESSARY. IT DISTURBS PEOPLE WHO WANT TO ENJOY NATURE AND IT NEGATIVELY IMPACTS THE ECOSYSTEM.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12899    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I am in favor of continuing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore, and would prefer minimal regulation be instituted on their use.

As a native of North Carolina, I would hope my view would carry greater weight than those not familiar with the resources and people of this state. Additionally, I view the negative economic impact associated with prohibiting ORV use not to be in the state's best fiscal interest at this time.

Thank you. Don Hire

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12900    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and spec

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12901	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Don't you have children?						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12902	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This letter is regarding Cape Hatteras National Seashore (a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty and wildlife diversity. The impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches. I oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife. Presently, the National Park Service is poised to adopt regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. However, this proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas. Yet the proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas. It only sets aside areas for ORVs and doesn't mandate specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. As well, year round, it allows 61% of the seashore for drivers and only 39% for wildlife and pedestrian protection. A temporary plan already in existence that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working for wildlife protection. In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. In 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline. We have made great progress in winning important protections for Hatteras' wildlife , and we can't lose traction now. ORV advocates want the entire seashore open to beach driving. I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12903	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please please don't allow this unregulated driving!!!! Wildlife depends on Cape Hatteras and we as people to protect them!!!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12904	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12905    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12906    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray:

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles and piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12907    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** ---Sample letter---

Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the

Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12908    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** My connection to this issue is that I live on this planet and care about all inhabitants. Please use your good will and common sense in protecting all aspects of the Hatteras national Seashore

Expecting your best, Lisa Estrada

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12909    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern: As a biologist and landscape architect off road vehicles are a total and unmitigated disaster when it comes to delicate shoreline and dune systems. Please remove them as soon as possible to protect this valuable environment. There are plenty of other sites for off roading. Sincerely, Thomas Hammock

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12910    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I understand the want for ORV's wanting to enjoy themselves. But there are areas that they can ride freely and not disturb wildlife and other visitors like myself who enjoy peace and safety while on beaches that restrict ORVs.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12911    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** RIN 1024-AD85: 36 CFR Part 7 - Proposed Rule

Under the proposed rule all ORV use will be subject to resource closures (which is unlawful according to Enabling Legislation, USC 459 that carries a mandate to develop the beaches for public recreation). Cape Point is expected to be closed to ORV use from March to August. This is unnecessary if NPS would manage the resources to allow people to use their park beaches. Sadly the NPS has no intention to accommodate the public. In a recent interview for the National Parks Traveler Mike Murray commented about plover habitat restoration at Cape Point: He was quoted: "Should we go out and bulldoze ponds in different locations? You've got to recognize that it'd be adverse modification of piping plover habitat. "Superintendent Murray said. " If the habitat is naturally occurring there you can't go mess it up in order to ensure access and then try to spend millions to create habitat further west. It is where it is. "

Mr. Murray's approach violates the law and continues to support the SELC agenda to restrict and remove vehicles from NPS lands. He views the CHNSRA beaches purely as wildlife habitat and ignores the legal mandate to develop the beaches for human water sports. His position shows a lack of understanding of the forces that created the present conditions at Cape Point: Before the 1930's Cape Point habitat was completely natural (although heavily grazed by cattle). During the great depression decade the topography was changed by man to create dune fields that would protect roads to develop a new park for the working people of the nation. In the 1950's the Dredge Hole was dug by man to supply sand just north of the point. In the 1960's straggler piping plovers discovered the bare sands around the Dredge Hole to be a prime nesting area. In the 1980's the NPS began their destruction of plover habitat by installing closures around the Dredge Hole which encouraged vegetative growth and new dune fields between the Dredge Hole and the ocean. Similar closures at other locations have also reduced the bare sand beaches compressing recreational usage and possible bird habitat together. Thus there is no virgin natural habitat at Cape Point. This mix of sand, grass and dune has all been influenced by the actions of man. Restoration to correct the NPS destruction would

certainly be appropriate. Increased corrective manipulation to intentionally create superior plover habitat to both improve fledging and provide public access to the recreational beaches would be preferred. Most of the area between the Dredge Hole and the Ocean may have once been bird habitat but is no longer utilized due to the vegetative growth which provides concealment for predators. Any change of topography is not an "adverse modification of piping plover habitat" but an improvement that can be scientifically structured to benefit the plovers. A heavy dose of common sense to beach management is necessary at CHNSRA. The system of buffer closures operated under the Consent Decree has not aided avian survival. The same program is carried through the proposed regulation and promises no further improvement meanwhile the public is denied lawful recreation and economic benefit. These dynamic beaches are not hospitable to wildlife. The NPS would prefer to disregard their data of poor success and maintain that whatever a creature picks as beach habitat, "It is where it is." They view this as the cheapest tool for NPS management with no regard to the human cost of their actions. This decision fails a cost/benefit analysis (see attached analysis by Luizer). Furthermore it leads to a violation of the parks enabling legislation that carries a mandate to develop the beaches for public recreation. Cape Point and the inlet spits are the most precious beaches for public use and must be protected or developed for that purpose. The NPS must change its resource management practices to adhere to that mandate. The present buffer system must be corrected.

Throughout the development of the EIS/RULE the NPS has been adamant to provide habitat for any bird species requested by Audubon. The law is quite clear as to the action NPS must take should they persist in that effort. The NPS will need to absorb the costs of material and personnel to provide for the keeping of any birdlife so selected. Since this is purely an NPS choice they can not pass the costs along as extra fees to the public. The law requires that areas especially adaptable for recreation shall be developed for recreation. Every inch of shoreline has proven adaptable for the types of recreation cited in that law. Most of the beaches have been amenable to vehicular operation to facilitate public access for those recreational pursuits. The NPS has made an issue about their desire for predictability. This can be achieved simply by designated Recreational Corridors to encompass: 1) Access roads and trails including interdunal trails 2) Access ramps 3) All beach front both ocean and sound defined as the land between the existing tide line and a point 100 meters from that tide line. This area will "float" with the dynamic conditions encountered at CHNSRA. 4) These corridors will be BFA ( Buffer Free Areas ) 5) There would be no pre-nesting established in the BFAs. Such closures would be in more productive areas. Bird protection or keeping can be performed by any method chosen by NPS outside of the BFA's. It would be recommended that NPS consult with other agencies or authorities as to the best methods for each species e.g. vegetation control, pond construction and water management, dredge spoil islands etc.

The NPS has shown a penchant to change names to remove vestiges of recreation from their new image of CHNSRA as a wildlife sanctuary. Consider these names: 1) " Canadian Hole " In my 40 years experience on the Outer Banks this sound side location was always named to represent its popularity for swimming and sailing by our visitors from Canada. Most of them spoke French and wore unique bathing attire. NPS renamed this " Haulover " 2) "Dredge Hole" Rather than admit this body of water near Cape Point was man made, the NPS considers this a "Salt Pond" with its natural connotations. 3) "Recreational Area" After the NPS had acquired enough land parcels to insure the establishment of their new park they were free to drop their subterfuge from the title of CHNSRA. Earlier the NPS "salesmen" portrayed the park as an attraction that would provide a higher standard of living for the islanders in order to grab their land. The ORV Rule must use the legal title of "Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area" and that very title should be used on all park signage and publications for the visitors.

Virginia L. Luizer P.O. Box 1092 Buxton, NC 27920 August 21, 2011

APPENDIX D--Cost/Benefit Analysis The DEIS was published on March 12, 2010. The FEIS was published on November 11, 2010. The record of decision to adopt the FEIS was published on December 20, 2010. The cost benefit analysis on which the DEIS, FEIS, and the record of decision were based was published on July 6, 2011. This timing of the above events denied the public any opportunity to comment on the cost benefit analysis. Even more disturbing is the fact that the DEIS and the FEIS were written without having a completed cost benefit analysis in hand. I submit that the DEIS and the FEIS conclusions were written in advance and the cost benefit analysis was written to support the conclusions presented in the DEIS and FEIS. Finally, as I will demonstrate below the cost benefit analysis effectively ignores the impact on the residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands, the economies of which are dependent upon visitation to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Based on these facts, I call upon the park service to rescind the record of decision, to redo the socio economic analysis using data available as opposed to using questionable data and erroneous models, and to resubmit the FEIS for public comment. RTI INTERNATIONAL COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS There are three flaws in the RTI International cost benefit analysis. The first is the definition of the ROI. In the Interim Plan, the park service defined the ROI as Outer Banks Dare and Hyde Counties. Comments demonstrated that this broad definition of the ROI served to minimize the impact on the 4,000 residents of the 8 villages of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands with economies that are dependent upon park visitation. RTI International used the same flawed definition of the ROI as was used by the park service in the Interim Plan. As evidenced by the statements presented below, using a wider ROI guaranteed the same result as achieved in the Interim Plan--that is, major negative impacts to the residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands would be summarily dismissed. "The impacts will have the largest impact on businesses in the Seashore villages. Visitors to other parts of the Dare County generally use the beaches in the northern part of the Outer Banks, which are outside the Seashore. Almost all of the businesses in the Seashore villages are small. Small businesses have a harder time absorbing revenue losses and there may be individual businesses that experience major impacts.1 The business impacts will fall most heavily on the Seashore villages and on small businesses. Some businesses north of the Seashore will be impacted by changes in ORV use; however, the impact on the villages north of the Seashore will be cushioned by the larger economic base of visitors who come primarily to use the beaches north of the Seashore. The Seashore villages depend most directly on visitors to the Seashore. Even if the overall impacts on Dare and Hyde counties or on the Seashore villages as a whole turn out to be smaller than anticipated, some individual businesses that depend on visitors to a particular beach access ramp may experience major impacts."2 The second flaw involves the data RTI International used for its analysis. The ranges reported to achieve a 95 percent confidence interval clearly demonstrate that the estimates are based upon flawed sample data.3 Third, RTI International used the a model to forecast economic impact that cannot possibly reflect the realities of the situation. The model used does not reflect the unique geography of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands and the resultant lack of close substitutes for employment and leisure. With respect to geography, the 8 villages are 1 Economic Analysis of ORV Use Regulations in Cape Hatteras National Seashore, RTI International, p. 3-26 2 Economic Analysis of ORV Use Regulations in

Cape Hatteras National Seashore, RTI International, p. 3-33 The data collected through the survey yielded an estimate of 344,999 vehicle trips on the beach in the Seashore between April and November 2009 with a 95 percent confidence interval ranges from 285,696 vehicle trips to 405,302 vehicle trips. The estimate of passengers is 768,948 passengers with a 95 percent confidence interval of 625,928 passengers to 911,968 passengers. Mean per person per trip value for Hatteras: \$11.14 95% confidence interval: (\$6.27 to \$39.03). Per person per trip loss from beach closure: \$5.27 to \$0. *ibid.*, pp. 2-7, 3-14 Page 16 of 22 surrounded either by park owned property or Pamlico Sound--each village is an island with the park being the sea. As such, the primary source of economic activity is park visitation. As per Superintendent Hanks' input into the Mission 66 plan for development, the park service fully expected to create this type of dependency and to support the village economies rather than create new development within the seashore.<sup>4</sup> The current reality is that the villages exist at the discretion of the park service. For example, consider the current Bonner Bridge controversy. The park service holds title to Pea Island but delegates management to USFWS. The replacement of the bridge has been blocked by USFWS for 18 years because USFWS does not want to continue to allow maintenance of Highway 12 and the power lines that supply electricity to the villages. Without the bridge and the road, residents will find it extremely difficult to gain access to the mainland. Without the bridge and road, it was impossible to sustain visitation and the economy at 1963 levels, let alone at today's levels. Bottomline, the model used does not allow for a closed economy such as the one that exists on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. As I will demonstrate below the costs of the proposed rule are substantial while the benefits are minimal. COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS Summary of Resource Management Strategies and Costs Over the years CHNSRA resources have been managed under a variety of plans. These plans are summarized below. Management Policies Annual Resource Management Cost 1 Percentage Change over 2004 Annual Protection Cost 1 Percentage Change over Interim Plan 1992-2003 Management N/A N/A N/A N/A 2004 Management -- Superintendent's Order 07:ORV Management \$ 223,349 N/A N/A N/A Interim Plan Prototype & Interim Plan (2005-2007) \$ 508,500 228% \$ 1,147,500 N/A Consent Decree (2008-2010) \$ 813,000 364% \$ 1,481,500 129% FEIS \$ 943,950 423% \$ 1,956,100 170% 1 2004 Management Costs as per Interim Plan, Interim Plan and Consent Decree Costs as per FEIS. The cost of the recent resource management policies are due in part to a more proactive approach to shorebird protection. The cost increases reflect increased monitoring with daily reports of every single nesting bird and chick. The cost increases also reflect increased predator control--every bird and animal that dares to come near historic nesting areas must run a gambit of leg hold traps. These traps have killed and/or injured other species of concern (Diamondback Terrapins) and even domestic animals. And if a favored bird (Piping Plover, Oystercatcher, or Colonial Waterbird) finds itself in distress, the NPS will either transfer the bird to long term care (2010 Oystercatcher report) or administer antibiotics/steroids on site (conversation with turtle patrol). While the NPS resource management costs are a matter of record, little has been done to document the impact of the more aggressive management policies that have been implemented over the past 7 years. These policies have sharply reduced the options available to park visitors. For example, under the 1992-2003 Management 4 "His plans encouraged park development near the villages for the convenience of the public, to promote village growth, and to concentrate development so to leave miles of beach front undisturbed. In the end, Hanks' prospectus determined the location and layout of most major developments at the park, including the fishing piers and camping sites." *ibid.* p. 162 Page 17 of 22 policy resource closures were erected to protect nests, rarely interfered with access, and never prevented through traffic between ORV ramps. This is NO longer true. Under current management, resource closures are erected NOT simply to protect nests but rather are based upon previous nests and "courtship" behavior, thus resource closures begin as early as mid March. Resource closures are larger and almost always extend to the shoreline. Finally, resource closures for turtle nests extend the time line for restricted access well into October. The end result is that an average of 25-30% of the shoreline is closed to "all" users and 65-70% of ORV use areas are closed. Through traffic between ORV ramps is a thing of the past and access points are frequently closed to "all" users, making them parking lots to nowhere. Finally, from May 1 to September 15, ORV access is limited to 6 am through 10 pm. This time restriction effectively shuts down spring and fall game fishing and shuts down the dawn and dusk time frames serious anglers cherish. Rather than attempt to determine the impact of the above noted restrictions, RTI International simply assumes that less ORV use is a positive for all visitors other than those who utilize ORVs and for wildlife. As I will demonstrate below the positive impacts on wildlife have not been realized. With respect to the impact on visitors, as documented in public meeting transcripts and comments submitted throughout the planning processes, the negative impact 1) on both ORV and pedestrian users, and 2) on the quality of life for the local community has been substantial. Further evidence of the negative impact on the local community can be found in the general attitude toward park personnel and the numerous incidents of stress related illnesses that have been reported by individuals who have been actively involved in this issue. RTI never mentions any of the above evidence. RTI does look at visitation but states that more aggressive resource protection policies have only been in effect since 2007 (3 years as of the writing of the cost benefit report) thus, RTI concludes that there is insufficient data to make a reliable estimate of average visitation.<sup>5</sup> This is not accurate. Instead, the data clearly shows that while visitation has been somewhat variable, each pullback has been followed by a new growth spurt. The most recent growth spurt (1997-2003) resulted in an average of 2.67 million visitors per year. Contrary to RTI, more aggressive resource protection policies began in 2004 or 7 years ago not 3 years ago. At this point, visitation dropped to 1993 levels. As restrictions have continued to increase, visitation has remained at or below 1993 levels. That is, this new level of visitation has persisted throughout the 7 years of aggressive management policies which is enough time to make an accurate estimate of annual visitation. 5 Economic Analysis of ORV Use Regulations in Cape Hatteras National Seashore, RTI International, p. 2-5 Page 18 of 22 This new level of visitation represents a 17.4% decline from the most recent growth spurt and a 24% decline from the last peak in 2002. Based upon the fact that the local economy is almost "exclusively" dependent upon tourism resulting from park visitation, this substantial "long term" decline has drained local businesses' emergency reserves. As such businesses are increasingly questioning their long term viability. Other businesses have closed and foreclosures on rental properties are commonplace. Businesses made these point quite clear when surveyed but RTI seems to have ignored it. So how has the NPS responded to the mounting complaints and the sharp decline in visitation? Just like RTI, the NPS attributes declines to other factors (i.e. the economy, gas prices, etc.). Actually the NPS goes further telling the residents they will get used to the "new normal" and that they will see new business opportunities for things like ecotourism and bird watching. 7 years later, the community is still waiting for the influx of ecotourism and bird watchers. Benefits Piping Plover Data for the Piping Plovers are summarized below. Management Strategy Fledge Rate (Chicks/Pair) 1992-2003 Management 0.63 2004 Management -- Superintendent's Order 07:ORV Management 0.00 Interim Plan Prototype & Interim Plan (2005-2007) 0.87 Consent Decree (2008-2011) 0.846 this is necessary look at the 2004 the fledge rate of 0.00. 7 Does this fledge rate indicate that the 2004 Management policy was a failure? If you look at the weather conditions you will see that there was a T-storm with high winds on 6/10 followed by Hurricane Alex on 7/31. These two weather events likely resulted in the total loss of all chicks for 2004. What about the 0.87 and 0.84 fledge rates for the 3 years under the Interim Plan and the 4 years under the Consent Decree? Are these results demonstrative of the success of the Interim Plan and the Consent Decree relative to the 1992-2003 Management Policy? Or are the Interim Plan and the Consent Decree fledge rates related to other factors--i.e. the lack of any storm activity? The data suggest that the difference between fledge rates for the recent management policies and

those reported for the 1992-2003 policies ARE weather related. Stated more specifically, if you remove the 4 years with storm activity<sup>8</sup> from the 1992-2003 Management period, the recalculated fledge rate is 0.85 which is right in line with the 0.87 and 0.84 fledge rates for "good" weather years included in the Interim Plan and the Consent Decree, respectively. In fact, based upon this data, I submit that the different management policies have had NO impact on the productivity of Piping Plover. 6 2010 Resource report adjusted to include 6 Preliminary data from the 6/23 through 6/29 Resource Management Summary 13 pairs, and 8/10 report indicates 10 fledged chicks. 7 Economic Analysis of ORV Use Regulations in Cape Hatteras National Seashore, RTI International, p. 2-5 8 Hurricane Allison on 6/3/1995, Tropical Storm Arthur on 6/17/1996, Hurricane Danny on 7/16/1997, and Tropical Storm Arthur on 7/24/2002 with fledge rates of 0.5, 0.21, 0.27, and 0.00, respectively NPS and USFWS use a 10 year time frame for assessing success or failure of a particular policy. As indicated by RTI when dealing with visitation, the reason for this practice is to filter out noise, such as the impact of weather or extraneous factors. To see why Page 19 of 22 Breeding Pairs 0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Year Breeding Pairs 0.00 0.20 0.40 0.60 0.80 1.00 1.20 1.40 1.60 1.80 Fledge Rates Breeding Pairs Fledge Rates Oystercatchers Data for the Oystercatchers are summarized below Management Strategy Fledge Rate (Chicks/Pair) 2000-2003 0.36 2004 Management -- Superintendent's Order 07:ORV Management 0.63 Interim Plan Prototype & Interim Plan (2005-2007) 0.43 Consent Decree (2008-2011) 1.00 For example, the fledge rate observed under the Consent Decree appears to be higher than that of previous policies. However, as the underlying data demonstrate, the Consent Decree fledge rate is being unduly influenced by the most recent two observations (2010 and 2011).<sup>9</sup> With the limited data set it is impossible to say whether these fledge rates will repeat. Based upon the past trend, it seems likely the fledge rates will fall again then return to a slightly higher rate than in 2008--that is will continue the "long term" trend of modest improvement. With respect to the population, the "long term" improvement in productivity has not translated into population growth. To the contrary, the Oystercatcher population at CHNSRA has continued to decline. Continued spending on productivity in the face of a declining population is a misallocation of resources. Colonial Waterbirds Due to the fact that CHNSRA management has changed the way it counts these colonies, it is impossible to make any statements regarding the benefits derived from new management techniques. Sea Turtles The main difference in management related to turtles is the Consent Decree ban on night driving. The rationale was that lights cause false crawls. The average false crawl ratio under the consent decree (2008 through 8/10/11) is 0.88. This figure is not statistically different from the average for the period of 2000-2008 of 1.0. Furthermore, the first recorded instance of a turtle take by a vehicle occurred during 2010 when the night driving ban was in effect. Is it possible that without the ban the driver would have had his lights on and would have seen the turtle? If this was intentional, would the presence of other night time users served as a deterrent? I submit that the answer to the latter is a resounding YES. This statement is based upon past experience. Furthermore, anglers that regularly frequent the beaches at dawn have helped notified park service resource personnel of nests missed by the morning patrols. Quite simply, the night time ban on ORV use has been counterproductive. <sup>9</sup> The 6/23 through 6/29 Resource Management Summary reports 17 breeding pair and the 8/10 report indicates 27 fledged chicks. Of particular note is that NO one management policy includes more than 4 observations. As indicated by RTI when dealing with visitation, the limited data set makes it impossible to evaluate any single policy. Page 20 of 22 Summary Despite the costs (i.e. the mass killing of wildlife thereby threatening the natural balance between predators and prey, adding nearly \$600,000 to the NPS resource management bill, and taking actions that have contributed to a 17.4% decline in visitation and stressed the local economy), new management policies have NOT resulted in improved productivity numbers for Piping Plovers nor have these actions halted the decline in the Oystercatcher and other non ESA listed populations at CHNSRA.

Despite this lack of success, the DOI/NPS plan to expand upon the previous unsuccessful efforts to boost shorebird productivity/populations and protect sea turtles. The estimated cost of the new resource protection efforts is nearly \$3 million dollars. This figure represents a 4-fold increase over 2004 resource management and a 2-fold increase over Interim Plan resource management and protection costs.

With respect to cost to the local economy, the NPS continues to write off the cost to the local community. RTI does make note of the significant impact on local businesses but then perpetuates past practice of defining the ROI so broadly as to negate the recognized impacts on the local economy. Finally, RTI ignores existing data and instead substitutes unreliable estimates of cost and a model that does not take into account the unique characteristics of the local economy to estimate future costs. Actually, RTI recognizes the limitation of their data and models when they state that calculating quantitative estimates was not possible.<sup>10</sup> Instead RTI chooses to provide "a qualitative ranking of the action alternatives relative to the no-action alternatives for the different categories of benefits and costs."

As I demonstrated above, we DO have reliable data as to the cost of the more aggressive policies that have been implement over the past 7 years--that is, a 17.4% decline in visitation, considerable dissatisfaction with opportunities to use park resources, and an erosion of the relationship between the park service and the local community. RTI and the NPS simply chose to ignore it.

With respect to what we can expect of the proposed rule and expanded protection efforts, comments from the DEIS/FEIS demonstrate that this trend in user dissatisfaction and tension between the community and the park service will continue to increase. In some cases businesses simply refuse to serve park personnel. With respect to the costs to the economy, Cape Cod National Seashore can provide some insight. Cape Cod National Seashore is similar to Cape Hatteras National Seashore in that they derive a good deal of their tourist income from park visitation. In 1996, following the implementation of similar efforts at Cape Cod visitation fell by 10% and has remained at that lower level. Insofar as the villages of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands are surrounded by park service property and are considerably smaller in terms of land mass available for private enterprise, there are less non park related activities available and it is quite likely that the decrease in visitation will exceed the 10% observed at Cape Cod.

As for the impact on the local economy, Cape Cod's economic base did contract with many businesses that catered to park visitors closing entirely and others scaling way back. As RTI notes, however, communities with a larger economic base are better able to absorb impact for reduced visitation than smaller economies who depend more directly on park visitation. The latter is a description of the 8 villages of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands that have a total population of 4,000. What did RTI have to say about the potential costs to such small communities? That they will experience major economic impacts.<sup>11</sup> That is, collect data from Cape Cod on business contractions and closings and expect that the economies of Hatteras and Ocracoke



Islands will experience much higher rates of business failures and loss of income due to reduced park visitation. 10 Economic Analysis of ORV Use Regulations in Cape Hatteras National Seashore, RTI International, p. 3-32 11 *ibid.* 3-33

The most egregious nature of all this is that the NPS/DOI "ensured" that the local economy would be "exclusively" dependent upon park visitation when the NPS/DOI "insisted" on acquiring all the land surrounding the villages on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands and thereby limited the amount of land available for village expansion. The NPS has to know that this plan will substantially change the lives of the 4,000 residents of the villages on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands, causing many residents to leave the Islands and resulting in a much lower standard of living for those residents who remain. Yet the DOI asserts that "this document will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities under the RFA (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)" and the OMB has asserted that "This rule will not have an effect of \$100 million or more on the economy. It will not adversely affect in a material way the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or Tribal governments or communities."

With respect to the benchmark of \$100 million, you could shut down the entire rental industry on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands and not reach this figure. 12 As such you must look to the relative impacts. In this regard, the population of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands totals a mere 4,000 and have an average per capita income of only \$40,000. Furthermore, as per RTI, "Almost all of the businesses in the Seashore villages are small." 13 and rely directly on park service visitation. These businesses have already endured 7 years of losses associated with a 17.4% decline in park visitation. And, as I have demonstrated above stand to endure at least another 10% decline as a result of this new rule. Even RTI admits that there will be a significant impact on businesses that rely directly on park visitation in areas impacted by the new rule which includes every village on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. This being the case, the only way the DOI and the OMB can possibly assert that the economic impact will not be material is if they have been misled or if they have chosen to turn a blind eye to reality.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12912	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Sea turtles are an important part of the environment, as are sea shore birds. The off road vehicles need more regulation so that nesting sites - which number much less than they should - can be protected. The wild life was there before us, and there way before our vehicles, so take a step not to crowd them out. Please, don't let the vehicles run over the homes of others, be they human or not.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12913	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12914	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Save the environment for our children. They deserve to see the rare birds, turtles, and all the animals alive.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12915	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.						

the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and

specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12916	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	i think driving shouldn't be allowed on seashores at all. not just for the birds, altho it is very important for their survival. the beach is the last place a person can go and not hear gasoline engines continually, even if we have to get there in our own gasoline engine. But the birds safety and ability to reproduce is being compromised by allowing driving on the beach. if you want to enjoy the seashore, you need to walk yourself there. there are plenty of pushcarts and other wheeled vehicles there anyway. I'm from SC and often walk on Kiawah Beach. I also pick up other people's litter as well as what washes in that i see. several people commended me for this, but none of them picked up a single thing. you get out of a place what you are willing to put in to it.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12917	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	# I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12918	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	"I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.						

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12919	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
---------------------------	-------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------	-----------------	---

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I just wanted to say that I believe any national seashore usage policy needs to consider the irreversible impacts such usage will have on wildlife, as well as native plant populations. To promote human recreation over the survival of shorebirds, turtles, and other species, is short sighted and irresponsible.

**Correspondence ID:** 12920    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed and/or killed.

**Correspondence ID:** 12921    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12922    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicle use should not be allowed on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. This beautiful treasure should offer safe haven for nesting birds and turtles. People should be able to enjoy the natural beauty of the shore and ocean without vehicles on the beach. Off road vehicles have no place on a national seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 12923    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 12924    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12925    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off roading along Cape Hatteras National Seashores is dangerous to the ecosystem and environment. My family and I enjoy those places where vehicles don't venture. This area needs to be restricted. Why does human nature and extreme sports need to ruin another ecosystem? There are plenty of places in the USA for that type of excitement. The national seashore is loved for its untouched areas. We humans need to respect our environment and care for it! We shouldn't always get our outdoor excitement whims and not look at the whole picture. We all need each other - plants, animals and humans. Thank you for listening!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12926    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife will be negatively impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12927    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Beaches are intended for use by people and are necessary and important habitat for nesting birds and turtles and other wildlife. Racing dune buggies and other recreational vehicles disrupt this use. Where protections from these vehicles is lacking, bird and turtle populations decline; where protections exist, they rebound. The NPS is considering permanent bans on such vehicles, but the proposed regulations make little reference to the importance of some beaches for wildlife habitat. Some of these beaches may even have to be restricted to any human use esp. during nesting season. The new regulations should not cater to the dune buggy crowd. There are places where these vehicles can be used without harming wildlife. In California we have set aside beaches for the use of Elephant seals only, where humans can watch from a non-disturbing distance. Please make the new NPS regulations put preservation of wildlife first.

Thank you. Richard and Jeanne Placone, Palo Alto, California

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12928    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12929    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12930    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We both appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. We are very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. We support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

We live in an area, the Monterey Bay area in California, that has similar nesting birds in dunes which are protected and those protections have done a great deal to help some endangered species, including the snowy plover.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12931    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12932    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I urge you to rewrite the regulations concerning off-road vehicle use at Cape Hatteras Nat'l Seashore. Off-road vehicles can obliterate and extirpate native nesting birds and have a devastating effect on turtles and other wildlife. As this is a national seashore, wildlife, habitat protection, and low-impact human use must be a priority. Please rewrite the regulations to strictly limit vehicles on the beach to particular zones where they won't conflict with wildlife concerns. Please also protect the rights of humans who wish to enjoy a day at the beach free from the noise, pollution, and disruption from vehicles. Thank you, Amy Lafferty

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12933    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow unlimited beach driving for ORVs. In fact the use of ORVs on the beach is horrible. They are destructive and useless. We do not need to encourage this type of mindless activity. If you need cheap thrills, go to a water park and ride

the zip line.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12934    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.

I oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife. The National Park Service is poised to adopt regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Yet the proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over.

We have made great progress in winning important protections for Hatteras' wildlife , and we can't lose traction now. ORV advocates want the entire seashore open to beach driving. The Park Service instead needs to support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12935    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12936    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12937    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

As a physician educated in the area of science, I am distressed that the NPS seems to be ignoring the value of science-based regulations. Why would the NPS want to override effective science-based policies with these new proposed regulations?

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12938    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12939    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** prohibit the use of off-road vehicles or any driving on the beaches of our coastlines. The eco-systems and wildlife cannot speak for themselves; I speak for them!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12940    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12941    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As an annual visitor to the Outer Banks and a lover of nature and wildlife, I am truly hoping you will give serious consideration to the suggestions for better protecting the habitat of the turtles and other animal and birds that make Hatteras their home. The current proposal by the National Park Service is not sufficient to protect these helpless inhabitants.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Jini Fisher

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12942    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12943    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.



John Murray

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12944    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

As a physician, I have been educated in the field of science. I find it impossible to understand why the NPS would choose to abandon effective science-based policies in favor of those which ignore the advice of scientists!

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12945    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please choose the Environment over recreational vehicle usage. There's really nothing to else to be done!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12946    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. The purpose of the National Seashore is to give people a respite from our current lifestyle; ORV use will destroy this purpose. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. Much more vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians, as well as a place for peace and quiet. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12947    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

Everyone is aware of how valuable healthy habitats are to the future of America. The time is now, for progressive, forward thinking choices, that protect already existing pristine ecosystems. I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area; Sea turtles that had only 82 nests in 2007, have laid 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife will be negatively impacted and that is not acceptable.. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, because a Park Service plan that protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife is unacceptable. The proposed plan sets aside only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use, with year-round or seasonal beach driving. More VEHICLE-FREE areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. It is imperative that protections for these animals and their habitats be implemented. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12948    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The destruction to the animal life is uncalled for, people who want to drive loud vehicles have many places to drive them

without causing havoc to the nature and beauty of ocean beaches. These are places of peace and renewal for so many, loud noises disturb people as well. We already have beaches destroyed by oil and trash washed on shore from uncaring boaters, the enjoyment of going to the beach is personal and pure nature is a major part of this.

Respect for each other and our environment is lost in our country full of individuals who only care for themselves, selfishness instead of caring for others is a sad disease in the USA now.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12949    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** There is no reason to ruin beaches and wildlife with motorized vehicles. Beaches are for walking in the quiet. Mankind has far too many destructive toys and habits.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12950    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment. ORV are a sacred thing in NC but I have to vote for the protection of the flora and fauna of the outer banks. Man has done enough damage to this planet. Let's share what we have and make room for other organisms. ORVs make deep ruts in the sand and young birds and turtles have no means for escaping them. I applaud leaving some areas of our National Parks free of ORV traffic. Let their noise pollution and tires remain out of some areas. It doesn't seem such an impossible thing to ask.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12951    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am an avid birdwatcher and lover of wildlife. When I vacation and visit areas such as Cape Hatteras my favorite pastime is viewing and observing the native wildlife. Thus, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration, Stacy Niemeyer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12952    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12953    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12954    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12955    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12956    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect sea animals against off shore vehicles. The off road vehicles kill and harm very precious lives of seabirds, turtles, nests. I urge you to improve the regulations for protection of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12957    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12958    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Protect Cape Hatteras' wildlife from all off road vehicles. The wildlife already have enough obstacles with global warming, habitat shrinkage, habitat poisons & toxins, human interference, air pollution, water pollution, etc without the carelessness of humans using vehicles to interfere and make obnoxious noises.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12959    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "Officially established in 1937 along the Outer Banks of North Carolina, Cape Hatteras is the nation's first national seashore. Consisting of more than 30,000 acres distributed along approximately 67 miles of shoreline, the Seashore is part of a dynamic barrier island system." As I will demonstrate below Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area was not "officially" established until January 1953. The final rule should be corrected so as to reflect the actual date of the establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area--January 12, 1953. The 1937 Act of Congress authorized the establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area on North Carolina's Outer Banks. This act did not establish Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area but rather set the requirements for the park, including the acquisition of 62,000 acres (10,000 minimum) to be completed within a 10 year period. 1 As of 1946 the acquisition was far from complete and land acquisition was discontinued. In 1946 Congress extended this deadline to 1952.2 With the new deadline fast approaching, the Secretary of the Interior agreed to reduce the size of the project to 28,500 acres.3 As of January 1953 Secretary Chapman was still far short of the smaller project.4 Rather than go to Congress and ask for another extension of the deadline for land acquisition or reducing the size of the project, Secretary Chapman proceeded to issue an order for the NPS to take control of the 12,414 acres that had been acquired.5 It is this order that marks the official establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area and allowed for deployment of the first permanent NPS personnel in May 1953.6

#### FOOTNOTES

1 The Creation and Establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore The Great Depression through Mission 66, Appendix A: Chronology of Selected Events in Park History, p. 210-211, FEIS Executive Summary, p. iv.

2 March 6, 1946 Congress amends the Act of August 17, 1937, by granting a five-year extension to allow North Carolina to continue oil explorations without fear that the National Park Service will abandon the project. The Creation and Establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore The Great Depression through Mission 66, Appendix A: Chronology of Selected Events in Park History, p. 210-211.

3 October 27, 1952 Secretary Chapman agrees to revised boundary designations after NPS meetings with villagers in the Outer Banks. The proposed seashore's official size is now 28,500 acres. More land is provided for village expansion while NPS control of the ocean beaches around these villages is narrowed. *ibid*, Benefit- Cost Analysis of Proposed ORV Use Regulations in Cape Hatteras National Seashore Prepared for National Park Service Environmental Quality Division Academy Place PO Box 25287 Denver, CO 80225 Prepared by Carol Mansfield Ross Loomis Fern Braun RTI International 3040 Cornwallis Road Research Triangle Park, NC 27709 RTI Project, p. 1-1.

4 As per the 1954 Order to Establish the park only 12,414 acres had been acquired. The Creation and Establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore The Great Depression through Mission 66, Appendix A: Chronology of Selected Events in Park History, p. 222.

5 January 12, 1953 Secretary Chapman issues an order directing certain lands of the Outer Banks of North Carolina to be "administered, protected, and developed by the National Park Service for national seashore recreational purposes for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." . ibid, Benefit-Cost Analysis of Proposed ORV Use Regulations in Cape Hatteras National Seashore Prepared for National Park Service Environmental Quality Division Academy Place PO Box 25287 Denver, CO 80225 Prepared by Carol Mansfield Ross Loomis Fern Braun RTI International 3040 Cornwallis Road Research Triangle Park, NC 27709 RTI Project, p. 1-1.

6 May 1953 First permanent NPS personnel arrive at the seashore for duty while park development begins on a limited scale. The Creation and Establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore The Great Depression through Mission 66, Appendix A: Chronology of Selected Events in Park History, p. 210-211.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12960    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12961    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Maria Pannenbacker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12962    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please be sure that regulations protect the natural wildlife that brings so many people to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

There already exist seashores in abundance whose viability has been severely devastated. The mission now is to protect what little remains for peoples' quiet enjoyment of nature, and viability of the natural habitat.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12963    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Re: Comment Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Cape Hatteras National Seashore

"Following the establishment of the Seashore in 1937, beach driving was primarily for the purpose of transportation, not recreation.

Because the area was sparsely populated, the number of ORVs on the beach was much smaller than it is today.

The paving of NC Highway 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."

The above suggests that beach driving did not exist prior to 1937. Really? Were there no vehicles? Vehicles were in widespread use elsewhere, so is the park service suggesting that there were no people prior to 1937? As evidenced by the fact that the first recorded vehicle accident on Hatteras Island was in 1920, I submit that there were BOTH people and vehicles before 1937.

Subsequent to 1937, the park service recognizes ORV use on the park's beaches but insists these vehicles were not used to engage in recreational activities. Really? I will demonstrate that beach driving for the purpose of engaging in recreational activities is a planned extension of the trend that was already evolving before the authorization of the park in 1937 and which continued long before the establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in 1953 NOT 1937.

Finally, the park service states that improved access resulting from the completion of Highway 12, the Bonner Bridge, and the Ocracoke Ferry in combination with "increased population, and the popularity of the sport utility vehicle have resulted in a dramatic increase in vehicle use on Seashore beaches." If beach driving had not been for the purpose of recreation and if beach driving was no longer required for transportation because of infrastructure improvements, then why did beach driving increase? I submit that the Federal Register description of beach driving is not accurate. For example, I will demonstrate that beach driving for the purpose of engaging in recreation not only began prior to 1953 but that subsequent to 1953 beach driving for the purpose of engaging in recreation was and still is supported by the park service.

Based upon the above, I submit that the park service has mischaracterized beach driving for recreational purposes as a "new" activity so as to justify a rule that requires a vast array of new infrastructure. Furthermore, characterizing beach driving as a "new" activity allows the park service to propose a rule that changes to long established ORV corridors and routes without having to prove that the established corridors and trails are "necessary to protect the resource, promote safety and minimize conflicts."

Establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area was 1953 not 1937

The 1937 Act of Congress authorized the establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area on North Carolina's Outer Banks. This act did not establish Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area but rather set the requirements for the park, including the acquisition of 62,000 acres (10,000 minimum) to be completed within a 10 year period. As of 1946 the acquisition was far from complete and land acquisition was discontinued. In 1946 Congress extended this deadline to 1952. With the new deadline fast approaching, the Secretary of the Interior agreed to reduce the size of the project to 28,500 acres. As of January 1953 Secretary Chapman was still far short of the smaller project. Rather than go to Congress and ask for another extension of the deadline for land acquisition or reducing the size of the project, Secretary Chapman proceeded to issue an order for the NPS to take control of the 12,414 acres that had been acquired. It is this order that marks the official establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area and allowed for deployment of the first permanent NPS personnel in May 1953.

Tourism and Beach Driving Trends from 1935 to 1957

Contrary to the Federal Register description of beach driving, the FEIS on which the rule is based characterizes beach driving in the following fashion:

"Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides a variety of visitor experiences. It is a long, essentially linear park, visitation is high, and parking spaces near roads are limited. Some popular beach sites, particularly those near the inlets and Cape Point, are a distance from established or possible parking spaces. Visitors who come for some popular recreational activities such as surf fishing and picnicking are accustomed to using large amounts and types of recreational equipment that cannot practically be hauled over these distances by most visitors without some form of motorized access. For many visitors, the time needed and the physical challenge of hiking to the distant sites, or for some even to close sites, can discourage or preclude access by nonmotorized means. As a result, 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."

This is the most accurate description of beach driving that I have seen. This description of beach driving applies not only to today but applies to the nature of beach driving long before the establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in 1953. In fact, tourism and beach driving for the purposes of engaging in recreational activities was established practice before Congress authorized Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in 1937. For example, as per the following

statement made by Lindsay Warren, tourism was well established in 1935.

"Conservatively speaking, this area is the greatest game and fishing spot on the American continent. Visitors go there almost the year round from every section of the nation, and just 18 miles off Hatteras is the Gulf Stream with its unrivaled fishing."

How did visitors get here in 1935? How did they travel the "long, essentially linear" beaches to get to the inlets and Cape Point to partake in the fishing spot in 1935? The park documents the mode of transportation in this picture.

What did visitors find when they got here in 1935? Where did they get supplies, where did they stay, who provided services, etc.? In 1935, visitors found an established population of around 1,600 to 1,800 spread among 8 villages on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. These villages were evolving from fishing villages into a modern tourist economy.

Between 1935 and 1941, the population and the tourist economy continued to grow. During this period, as part of the new deal, the government engaged in dune construction designed to mitigate the impacts of storms, deforestation, and overgrazing. The existence of the dunes did not stop beach driving as a means of engaging in recreational activities. Instead commercial fisherman would cut make-shift ramps in the dunes. These make-shift ramps were also used by the general public. For example, see the 1947 video Van Campen Heilner surf fishing film.

By 1952 a road was completed from Oregon Inlet to Rodanthe, land values had skyrocketed, and "tourist courts and hotels were already going up in the villages, including one built on land shown by maps to be state property and once seen as a possible donation." That is, the tourist economy was thriving and the residents of the villages were none to sure about the impact of a park that would "surround" the villages creating islands of development entirely dependent upon park service management policies. The village residents protested the creation of the park and challenged DOI condemnations of their land. The residents feared their economic development would be hampered by government regulations and too little land. Additionally, the park had refused to allow the continuation of highway 12 south of Rodanthe. The residents saw this roadway as necessary to sustain the growth of the tourist based economy. The residents also feared that they would loose beach access (hunting had already been narrowly defined and there had been rumblings about restricting beach driving thus it is clear that access meant beach driving). In the end the park service recognized that it had to accept the villages. In fact Superintendent Hanks recommended the development of a roadway along the entire length of the park. Hanks plans "encouraged park development near the villages for the convenience of the public, to promote village growth, and to concentrate development so to leave miles of beach front undisturbed." by park development. Both of these recommendations were ultimately included in the Mission 66 Prospectus which would serve as the guideline for park development.

Subsequent to the approval of the Mission 66 Prospectus in 1956, beach driving not only continued but was supported by the NPS with 6 road ramps constructed in 1957 as part of a dune restoration project 6.

Furthermore, while the government was still in the process of acquiring land, before the park was dedicated in 1958, and 7 years before the completion of highway 12 and the Bonner Bridge, tourism levels were large enough to cause significant traffic jams at Oregon Inlet.

Despite this level of tourism, beach driving for purpose of engaging in recreational activities, as practiced between the 1930s until well into the 1960s, resulted in few complaints or conflicts between vehicle-users and other beach-goers. In fact, despite this level of tourism and beach driving for purposes of engaging in recreational activities, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Roger Ernst stated that the "Outer Banks were judged particularly desirable because of their great potential for public use." He further noted that the park was to be "the first of a new class of national park that safeguarded the seashore from extensive development while guaranteeing the American public unencumbered access to beaches". In the final assessment this new model was judged to be "greatly successful in achieving the essential vision and aims of its founders." In fact, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area became an "important model for subsequent similar parks around the country."

In summary, contrary to the characterization of beach driving presented in the proposed rule, beach driving for the purposes of engaging in recreational activities was common place prior to the establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Furthermore, beach driving for the purposes of engaging in recreational activities continued long after the establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area and did NOT result in significant complaints from other users. Finally, this activity was supported by the NPS. Nonetheless, the park service does not attempt to justify the need for changing long established corridors and ORV routes and the added infrastructure needed to implement the proposed rule.

#### Recommended Solution

First, revise the federal register description of beach driving so as to be consistent with the FEIS and the reality of the situation--that is, a long established activity that is a necessary and integral part of recreation at Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

Second, revise the rule to satisfy the EO. Stated more specifically, the EO does NOT require a more restrictive regulation. The EO DOES require that "the designation of such areas and trails will be based upon the protection of the resources of the public lands, promotion of the safety of all users of those lands, and minimization of conflicts among the various uses of those lands." This can and should be based upon existing infrastructure and long established ORV corridors and routes. As such, I respectfully request that you implement Alternative A (2007 FOSNI Interim Strategy) and codify the ORV Management

Policies contained therein. With respect to the Interim Plan, as evidenced by facts

1. that there was no final adjunction or admission of the violations claimed by SELC, et al as they related to the Interim Plan, 2. that there were no negative impacts on managed species either during the implementation of the prototype of the Interim Plan in 2005 & 2006 or the first year of the full implementation of the Interim Plan (2007), 3. that the more aggressive management approach used in 2008 through 2011 did not result in any marked improvement for managed species, and 4. that the Interim Plan triggers and buffers are consistent with the triggers and buffers utilized at other seashores,

there is NO basis for proposing a rule that relies on a whole host of infrastructure improvements and that reduces access to over-utilized ORV areas while increasing access to under-utilized VFAs. Furthermore, continuation of the Interim Plan would leave twice as much room for visitors of all types to spread out thus, would add to the variety of experiences available to visitors and would minimize the potential for crowding and user conflicts without denying visitors access.

Finally, to minimize the threat of a challenge from the environmental groups, I request that the NPS reconsider the decision not to designate Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area as Traditional Cultural Properties. In this regard Mr. Murray made his original determination based upon the opinion that beach driving had been practiced for fewer than 50 years. In this rule, Mr. Murray acknowledges that beach driving has been practiced since at least 1937 (74 years) but states that beach driving was primarily for the purpose of transportation, not recreation. I have supplied ample evidence that beach driving for the purposes of engaging in recreational activities has been common place since at least 1920--32 years prior to the establishment of Cape Hatteras National Recreational Area in 1953 and at least 91 years in total. I have also provided ample evidence that a thriving tourist-based economy existed well before the park was established and that concerns that the park would limit continued expansion or even fail to sustain the existing economy nearly resulted in the failure to complete the land acquisition required to satisfy the enabling legislation of 1937. Its time to stop placating the environmentalists' and do what is right for the good people of Hatters and Ocracoke Islands, the alternative is a slow death of the villages and ruination of the lives of the 4,000 residents of these Islands many of whom can date their lineage back to the Croatoan Indians that inhabited these islands and the first English settlers who intermingled with the Croatoan Indians of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12964    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12965    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12966    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not



continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12967    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12968    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12969    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We live near Sandy Hook in NJ and we love watching birds there and on our little beach down the block. We occasionally also have turtles coming on the beach, a beautiful sighting and something worth fighting for.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12970    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12971    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** The DOI asserts that "this document will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities under the RFA (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)." and the OMB has asserted that "This rule will not have an effect of \$100 million or more on the economy. It will not adversely affect in a material way the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or Tribal governments or communities."

At the same time, the proposed rule takes note of the fact that "100 percent of the rule's impacts would fall on small businesses." The rationale for the conclusion that the rule will not have a material impact on the economy is as follows:

"The proposed rule includes a number of measures designed to mitigate effect on the number of visitors as well as the potential for indirect economic effects on village businesses that profit from patronage by Seashore visitors using ORVs. These include: New pedestrian and ORV beach access points, parking areas, pedestrian trails, routes between dunes, and ORV ramps to enhance ORV and pedestrian access; a designated year-round ORV route at Cape Point and South Point, subject to resource closures when breeding activity occurs; and pedestrian shoreline access along ocean and inlet shorelines adjacent to shorebird pre-nesting areas until breeding activity is observed. In addition, we will seek funding for an alternative transportation study and consider applications for businesses to offer beach and water shuttle services. These extra efforts to increase overall access and visitor use under the Selected Action, which we developed with extensive public involvement, should increase the probability that the economic impacts are on the low rather than high end of the range."

The above description of efforts to mitigate economic impact is not accurate. For example, the year round ORV routes at Cape Point and South Point are not new thus, they do nothing to mitigate the effect on visitors. Similarly, the pedestrian shoreline access is not new thus, does nothing to mitigate the effect on visitors.

With respect to the list of infrastructure improvements, there has been absolutely no evidence of progress on any of the above infrastructure improvements. This being the case, how does the park service expect to have these improvements in place by November 15 when the permit portion of the rule goes into effect? I submit that the implementation of the permit without the specified infrastructure improvements is a violation of the rule.

With respect to the permit itself, the proposed rule does not specify the amount of the permit fee. As such, it is impossible to determine the impact of the proposed permit. For example, a nominal fee will have much less impact than a fee of say \$150 to \$200. Fewer visitors or residents will be able to justify the latter, especially since the permit fee will not guarantee access to the park's beaches. Without any estimate of the permit fee, the proposed rule is not complete.

Finally, the proposed rule is not realistic. As I have demonstrated in my comment on cost benefit analysis, RTI and the park service ignored the realities of the costs and the benefits derived from more aggressive resource management. Similarly, RTI and the park service have failed to provide any quantitative estimate of the future impacts of the ORV rule. Furthermore, the infrastructure improvements listed in the rule are not likely to be funded and cannot possibly be completed by the implementation date set for the permit. In fact, in this economic/political climate it is extremely unlikely that the park service will receive funding for the infrastructure improvements. This being the case and since, the projected impacts are based upon

completion of the infrastructure improvements the projected impacts will almost certainly be more significant than projected.

#### Recommended Solution

I respectfully request that you write a realistic rule that satisfies the EO. Stated more specifically, the EO does NOT require a more restrictive regulation. The EO DOES require that "the designation of such areas and trails will be based upon the protection of the resources of the public lands, promotion of the safety of all users of those lands, and minimization of conflicts among the various uses of those lands." This can and should be based upon existing infrastructure and long established ORV corridors and routes. As such, I respectfully request that you implement Alternative A (2007 FOSNI Interim Strategy) and codify the ORV Management Policies contained therein. With respect to the Interim Plan, as evidenced by facts

1. that there was no final adjunction or admission of the violations claimed by SELC, et al as they related to the Interim Plan, 2. that there were no negative impacts on managed species either during the implementation of the prototype of the Interim Plan in 2005 & 2006 or the first year of the full implementation of the Interim Plan (2007), 3. that the more aggressive management approach used in 2008 through 2011 did not result in any marked improvement for managed species, and 4. that the Interim Plan triggers and buffers are consistent with the triggers and buffers utilized at other seashores,

there is NO basis for proposing a rule that relies on a whole host of infrastructure improvements and that reduces access to over-utilized ORV areas while increasing access to under-utilized VFAs. Furthermore, continuation of the Interim Plan would leave twice as much room for visitors of all types to spread out thus, would add to the variety of experiences available to visitors and would minimize the potential for crowding and user conflicts without denying visitors access. As such, implementation of the Interim Plan will fulfill the requirements of section 3 of the E.O.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12972	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12973	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please enact explicit protections for animals in your park to protect all species from harm by vehicles. Thank you.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12974	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Off-road vehicles are destructive to the wildlife in this area. As a native North Carolinian, I am deeply concerned. I know how difficult it is for the sea turtles who lay their eggs in the sand to survive, and they are endangered. The birds and other wildlife in Hatteras are equally vulnerable.						

Please get rid of all recreational off-road vehicles, as the survival of these precious animals are at stake.

Thank you.

Malcolm Groome Topanga, CA

born in Greensboro, NC and graduate of UNC-Chapel Hill

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12975	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	"The proposed rule would authorize ORV use at the Seashore, manage it to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources and natural processes, and provide a variety of safe visitor experiences while minimizing conflicts among various users."						

In point of fact, the proposed rule expands the park's most under utilized areas (vehicle free areas) while reducing areas (ORV areas) that have become so congested under the consent decree that it nearly impossible to engage in many popular activities (i.e. fishing, surfing, or any other activity that require some elbow room). This, in combination with unprecedented approaches to resource management and a wide range of new restrictions on visitor use, will dramatically reduce the shoreline available for visitor use, severely limit the variety of access opportunities available for ALL visitors, and increase the potential for conflicts among users in the areas that remain open to recreational use. This being case, this rule violates section 3 of the E.O.

#### Unprecedented Approaches to Resource Management

Alternative F proposes a new designation, namely Species Management Areas. Species Management Areas are designed to minimize "human disturbance" and are based upon habitat and species use patterns observed during the past 5 years. The only option for early review of designated Species Management Areas is if species management goals are not achieved or if weather events alter the habitat. If either of these events occur the proposal calls for expansion of the Species Management Areas to facilitate recovery of populations or to take advantage of newly created habitat. The end result of this new approach to species management is to mandate the closure of a minimum 13-16 miles of beach for the both Spring and Summer seasons, even if habitat becomes unsuitable or species fail to use the area.

Alternative F defines an unprecedented standard for species management outside of the Species Management Areas--namely, ML1. ML1 protocols use "larger, longer-lasting buffers" to protect wildlife. While it is not possible to predict the number of miles that will be closed by these unprecedented protocols, it is possible to use the pattern of closures that have resulted from the past two years of management under the consent decree to make a fairly accurate estimate of potential closures. A review of the Beach Access reports for 2008 and 2009 shows a pattern of wide-spread full-beach resource closures spanning the period of 5/15 to 8/15. Based upon the fact that the predicted ML1 closures will be added to the mandated Species Management Area closures, it is more than likely that the resource management proposal will relegate access for ALL visitors to either the high density village front beaches or 15 miles of shoreline spread over 10 areas. The length of the shoreline available in these 10 areas will likely range from as little as 1/2 mile beach parking lots to a maximum of 2.7 miles. In effect, the resource management proposal will likely turn the beaches available outside of the village fronts into virtual parking lots with the only opportunity for a remote experience being relegated to pedestrian day use at Pea Island. Furthermore, by reducing access areas to such small spaces, the potential for overcrowding and user conflicts will increase dramatically.

#### New Restrictions on Visitor Use

The ORV management proposal sets a peak use limit and an adds an ORV permit requirement. The fee associated with the proposed ORV permit will be set to recover the cost associated with ORV management. Neither the proposed rule nor the FEIS provide any estimate of the cost of a permit. Depending upon the cost and recognizing that the purchase of a permit will not guarantee access if the peak use limit has been reached, it is very possible that many visitors will be unable to justify an expenditure for something they may not be able to use. Ironically, Hatteras and Ocracoke Island residents who provide support services to the park visitors and with average incomes below \$40,000 will be the hardest hit by the permit fee and will be least likely to find a beach not full up by the time they get off of work or on weekends.

Other new restrictions on visitor use include restricting or eliminating access to productive off season fishing grounds and time restrictions that preclude access during the most productive fishing hours. These hours are also the least crowded times of day thus reduce the possibility of user conflicts. Also, opportunities for night sky viewing, beach fires, and a wide range of other early evening or night time activities will be sharply curtailed. The new restrictions will have the biggest impact on the shoulder season activities such as surf fishing (Hatteras Island is home to the world record Red Drum landing and the worlds largest saltwater fishing tournament) and water sports (i.e. surfing, kite boarding, etc.). Finally, the time restrictions will make it impossible for the working resident to access the beach before or after work or at night as has been custom since long before the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area was even suggested. Limiting the leisure time options of low income residents of the Island villages which exist as islands surrounded by Park Service property and Pamlico Sound and are totally dependent traditional access to the park's beaches is unconscionable. As evidenced by the following statements make by former Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes and Assistant Secretary of the Interior Roger Ernst, this rule runs counter to NPS's original intent to preserve "public access to free beaches, especially for 'people of low income groups'".

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

20 years later, Secretary Ickes' vision was reaffirmed during the dedication of the park when Roger Ernst Assistant Secretary of the Interior stated that the "Outer Banks were judged particularly desirable because of their great potential for public use." That is, the park was to be "the first of a new class of national park that safeguarded the seashore from extensive development while guaranteeing the American public unencumbered access to beaches". In the final assessment this new model was judged to be "greatly successful in achieving the essential vision and aims of its founders." In fact, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area became an "important model for subsequent similar parks around the country."

Even the current FEIS recognizes the importance and long standing nature of beach driving for recreation.

"Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides a variety of visitor experiences. It is a long, essentially linear park, visitation is high, and parking spaces near roads are limited. Some popular beach sites, particularly those near the inlets and Cape Point, are a distance from established or possible parking spaces. Visitors who come for some popular recreational activities such as surf fishing and picnicking are accustomed to using large amounts and types of recreational equipment that cannot practically be hauled over these distances by most visitors without some form of motorized access. For many visitors, the time needed and the physical challenge of hiking to the distant sites, or for some even to close sites, can discourage or preclude access by nonmotorized means. As a result, 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."

Unfortunately, recreational access to national seashores has been eroded by Environmentalists' demands with only Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area and Padre Island retaining "some" of the characteristics originally envisioned for this class of park. We have many protected seashore areas up and down the east and west coast. And while protection of wildlife is necessary, there is also a need to retain areas where mankind can go to recreate and get away from the rigors of modern life. Two such areas, one east coast and one west coast park reserved for the originally intended purpose of preserving "public access to free beaches, especially for 'people of low income groups'" is not too much to ask--it is as the President says a "balanced" approach.

#### Recommended Solution

The EO does NOT require a more restrictive regulation. The EO DOES require that "the designation of such areas and trails will be based upon the protection of the resources of the public lands, promotion of the safety of all users of those lands, and minimization of conflicts among the various uses of those lands." This can and should be based upon existing infrastructure and long established ORV corridors and routes. As such, I respectfully request that you implement Alternative A (2007 FOSNI Interim Strategy) and codify the ORV Management Policies contained therein. With respect to the Interim Plan, as evidenced by facts

1. that there was no final adjunction or admission of the violations claimed by SELC, et al as they related to the Interim Plan, 2. that there were no negative impacts on managed species either during the implementation of the prototype of the Interim Plan in 2005 & 2006 or the first year of the full implementation of the Interim Plan (2007), 3. that the more aggressive management approach used in 2008 through 2011 did not result in any marked improvement for managed species, and 4. that the Interim Plan triggers and buffers are consistent with the triggers and buffers utilized at other seashores,

there is NO basis for proposing a rule that relies on a whole host of infrastructure improvements and that reduces access to over-utilized ORV areas while increasing access to under-utilized VFAs. Furthermore, continuation of the Interim Plan would leave twice as much room for visitors of all types to spread out thus, would add to the variety of experiences available to visitors and would minimize the potential for crowding and user conflicts without denying visitors access. As such, implementation of the Interim Plan will fulfill the requirements of section 3 of the E.O.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12976	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	"I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.						

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in

2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and spe

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12977    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12978    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

The DEIS was published on March 12, 2010. The FEIS was published on November 11, 2010. The record of decision to adopt the FEIS was published on December 20, 2010. The cost benefit analysis on which the DEIS, FEIS, and the record of decision were based was published on July 6, 2011.

This timing of the above events denied the public any opportunity to comment on the cost benefit analysis. Even more disturbing is the fact that the DEIS and the FEIS were written without having a completed cost benefit analysis in hand. I submit that the DEIS and the FEIS conclusions were written in advance and the cost benefit analysis was written to support the conclusions presented in the DEIS and FEIS. Finally, as I will demonstrate below the cost benefit analysis effectively ignores the impact on the residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands and the local economies which depend directly upon visitation to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Based on these facts, I call upon the park service to rescind the record of decision, to redo the socio economic analysis using data available as opposed to using questionable data and erroneous models, and to resubmit the FEIS for public comment.

#### RTI INTERNATIONAL COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

There are three flaws in the RTI International cost benefit analysis. The first is the definition of the ROI. In the Interim Plan, the park service defined the ROI as Outer Banks Dare and Hyde Counties. Comments demonstrated that this broad definition of the ROI served to minimize the impact on the 4,000 residents of the 8 villages of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands with economies that are dependent upon park visitation. Nonetheless RTI International used the same flawed definition of the ROI as was used by the park service Interim Plan. As evidenced by the statements presented below, using a wider ROI guaranteed the same result as achieved in the Interim Plan--that is, major negative impacts to the residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands would be summarily dismissed.

"The impacts will have the largest impact on businesses in the Seashore villages. Visitors to other parts of the Dare County generally use the beaches in the northern part of the Outer Banks, which are outside the Seashore. Almost all of the businesses in the Seashore villages are small. Small businesses have a harder time absorbing revenue losses and there may be individual businesses that experience major impacts."

"The business impacts will fall most heavily on the Seashore villages and on small businesses. Some businesses north of the Seashore will be impacted by changes in ORV use; however, the impact on the villages north of the Seashore will be cushioned by the larger economic base of visitors who come primarily to use the beaches north of the Seashore. The Seashore villages depend most directly on visitors to the Seashore. Even if the overall impacts on Dare and Hyde counties or on the Seashore villages as a whole turn out to be smaller than anticipated, some individual businesses that depend on visitors to a particular beach access ramp may experience major impacts."

The second flaw involves the data RTI International used for its analysis. The huge ranges required to achieve a 95 percent

confidence interval clearly demonstrate that the estimates are based upon flawed sample data.

Third, RTI International used the a model to forecast economic impact that cannot possibly reflect the realities of the situation. The model used does not reflect the unique geography of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands and the resultant lack of close substitutes for employment and leisure. With respect to geography, the 8 villages are surrounded either by park owned property or Pamlico Sound--each village is an island with the park being the sea. As such, the primary source of economic activity is park visitation. As per Superintendent Hanks' input into the Mission 66 plan for development, the park service fully expected to create this type of dependency and to support the village economies rather than create new development within the seashore.

The current reality is that the villages exist at the discretion of the park service. For example, consider the current Bonner Bridge controversy. The park service holds title to Pea Island but delegates management to USFWS. The replacement of the bridge has been blocked by USFWS for 18 years because USFWS does not want to continue to allow maintenance of Highway 12 and the power lines that supply electricity to the villages. Without the bridge and the road, residents will find it extremely difficult to gain access to the mainland. Without the bridge and road, it was impossible to sustain visitation and the economy at 1963 levels, let alone at today's levels. Without the bridge and road, the villages will loose access to modern communications and electricity. This is exactly what happened on 8/27 when Hurricane Irene breeched Pea Island and North Ocracoke. Bottom line, the model used does not allow for a closed economy such as the one that exists on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. As I will demonstrate below the costs of the proposed rule are substantial while the benefits are minimal. As such the proposed rule violates a variety of regulations that define acceptable economic impacts.

#### COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS

##### Summary of Resource Management Strategies and Costs

Over the years CHNSRA resources have been managed under a variety of plans. These plans are summarized below.

Management Policies	Annual Resource Management Cost	1 Percentage Change over 2004	Annual Protection Cost	1 Percentage Change over Interim Plan 1992-2003
Management N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2004 Management -- Superintendent's Order 07:ORV				
Management \$ 223,349	N/A	N/A	Interim Plan Prototype & Interim Plan (2005-2007) \$ 508,500	228%
Consent Decree (2008-2010) \$ 813,000	364%	\$ 1,481,500	129%	FEIS \$ 943,950
			423%	\$ 1,956,100
				170%
				1

2004 Management Costs as per Interim Plan, Interim Plan and Consent Decree Costs as per FEIS.

The cost of the recent resource management policies are due in part to a more proactive approach to shorebird protection. The cost increases reflect increased monitoring with daily reports of every single nesting bird and chick. The cost increases also reflect increased predator control--every bird and animal that dares to come near historic nesting areas must run a gambit of leg hold traps. These traps have killed and/or injured other species of concern (Diamondback Terrapins) and even domestic animals. And if a favored bird (Piping Plover, Oystercatcher, or Colonial Waterbird) finds itself in distress, the NPS will either transfer the bird to long term care (2010 Oystercatcher report) or administer antibiotics/steroids on site (conversation with turtle patrol).

While the NPS resource management costs are a matter of record, little has been done to document the impact of the more aggressive management policies that have been implemented over the past 7 years. These policies have sharply reduced the options available to park visitors. For example, under the 1992-2003 Management policy resource closures were erected to protect nests, rarely interfered with access, and never prevented through traffic between ORV ramps. This is NO longer true. Under current management, resource closures are erected NOT simply to protect nests but rather are based upon previous nests and "courtship" behavior, thus resource closures begin as early as mid March. Resource closures are larger and almost always extend to the shoreline. Finally, resource closures for turtle nests extend the time line for restricted access well into October. The end result is that an average of 25-30% of the shoreline is closed to "all" users and 65-70% of ORV use areas are closed. Through traffic between ORV ramps is a thing of the past and access points are frequently closed to "all" users, making them parking lots to nowhere. Finally, from May 1 to September 15, ORV access is limited to 6 am through 10 pm. This time restriction effectively shuts down spring and fall game fishing and shuts down the dawn and dusk time frames serious anglers cherish.

Rather than attempt to determine the impact of the above noted restrictions, RTI International simply assumes that less ORV use is a positive for all visitors other than those who utilize ORVs and for wildlife. As I will demonstrate below the positive impacts on wildlife have not been realized.

With respect to the impact on visitors, as documented in public meeting transcripts and comments submitted throughout the planning processes, the negative impact 1) on both ORV and pedestrian users, and 2) on the quality of life for the local community has been substantial. Further evidence of the negative impact on the local community can be found in the general attitude toward park personnel and the numerous incidents of stress related illnesses that have been reported by individuals who have been actively involved in this issue.

RTI never mentions any of the above evidence. RTI does look at visitation but states that more aggressive resource protection policies have only been in effect since 2007 (3 years as of the writing of the cost benefit report) thus, RTI concludes that there is insufficient data to make a reliable estimate of average visitation.

This is not accurate. Instead, the data clearly shows that while visitation has been somewhat variable, each pullback has been

followed by a new growth spurt. The most recent growth spurt (1997-2003) resulted in an average of 2.67 million visitors per year. Contrary to RTI, more aggressive resource protection policies began in 2004 or 7 years ago not 3 years ago. At this point, visitation dropped to 1993 levels. As restrictions have continued to increase, visitation has remained at or below 1993 levels. That is, this new level of visitation has persisted throughout the 7 years of aggressive resource management policies. 7 years IS enough time to make an accurate estimate of annual visitation.

This new level of visitation represents a 17.4% decline from the most recent growth spurt and a 24% decline from the last peak in 2002. Based upon the fact that the local economy is almost "exclusively" dependent upon tourism resulting from park visitation, this substantial "long term" decline has drained local businesses' emergency reserves. As such businesses are increasingly questioning their long term viability. Other businesses have closed and foreclosures on rental properties are commonplace. Businesses made these point quite clear when surveyed but RTI seems to have ignored it. If you don't believe me watch the following full length documentary-- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mFnitiNyZRc>

So how has the NPS responded to the mounting complaints and the sharp decline in visitation? Just like RTI, the NPS attributes declines to other factors (i.e. the economy, gas prices, etc.). Actually the NPS goes further telling the residents they will get used to the "new normal" and that they will see new business opportunities for things like ecotourism and bird watching. 7 years later, the community is still waiting for the influx of ecotourism and bird watchers.

Benefits

Piping Plover

Data for the Piping Plovers are summarized below.

Management Strategy Fledge Rate (Chicks/Pair) 1992-2003 Management 0.63 2004 Management -- Superintendent's Order 07:ORV Management 0.00 Interim Plan Prototype & Interim Plan (2005-2007) 0.87 Consent Decree (2008-2011) 0.84

NPS and USFWS use a 10 year time frame for assessing success or failure of a particular policy. As indicated by RTI when dealing with visitation, the reason for this practice is to filter out noise, such as the impact of weather or extraneous factors.

To see why this is necessary look at the 2004 the fledge rate of 0.00. Does this fledge rate indicate that the 2004 Management policy was a failure? No. If you look at the weather conditions you will see that there was a T-storm with high winds on 6/10 followed by Hurricane Alex on 7/31. These two weather events were recognized as indirectly resulting in the total loss of all chicks for 2004.

What about the 0.87 and 0.84 fledge rates for the 3 years under the Interim Plan and the 4 years under the Consent Decree? Are these results demonstrative of the success of the Interim Plan and the Consent Decree relative to the 1992-2003 Management Policy? Or are the Interim Plan and the Consent Decree fledge rates related to other factors--i.e. the lack of any storm activity?

The data suggest that the difference between fledge rates for the recent management policies and those reported for the 1992-2003 policies ARE weather related. Stated more specifically, if you remove the 4 years with storm activity from the 1992-2003 Management period, the recalculated fledge rate is 0.85 which is right in line with the 0.87 and 0.84 fledge rates for "good" weather years included in the Interim Plan and the Consent Decree, respectively. In fact, based upon this data, I submit that the different management policies have had NO impact on the productivity of Piping Plover. Oystercatchers

Data for the Oystercatchers are summarized below

Management Strategy Fledge Rate (Chicks/Pair) 2000-2003 0.36 2004 Management -- Superintendent's Order 07:ORV Management 0.63 Interim Plan Prototype & Interim Plan (2005-2007) 0.43 Consent Decree (2008-2011) 1.00 Of particular note is that NO one management policy includes more than 4 observations. As indicated by RTI when dealing with visitation, the limited data set makes it impossible to evaluate any single policy.

For example, the fledge rate observed under the Consent Decree appears to be higher than that of previous policies. However, as the underlying

data demonstrate, the Consent Decree fledge rate is being unduly influenced by the most recent two observations (2010 and 2011). With the limited data set it is impossible to say whether these fledge rates will repeat. Based upon the past trend, it seems likely the fledge rates will fall again then return to a slightly higher rate than in 2008--that is, productivity will continue the "long term" trend of modest improvement.

With respect to the population, the "long term" improvement in productivity has not translated into population growth. To the contrary, the Oystercatcher population at CHNSRA has continued to decline. Continued spending on productivity in the face of a declining population is a misallocation of resources.



## Colonial Waterbirds

Due to the fact that CHNSRA management has changed the way it counts these colonies, it is impossible to make any statements regarding the benefits derived from new management techniques.

## Sea Turtles

The main difference in management related to turtles is the Consent Decree ban on night driving. The rationale was that lights cause false crawls. The average false crawl ratio under the consent decree (2008 through 8/10/11) is 0.88. This figure is not statistically different from the average for the period of 2000-2008 of 1.0. Furthermore, the first recorded instance of a turtle take by a vehicle occurred during 2010 when the night driving ban was in effect. Is it possible that without the ban the driver would have had his lights on and would have seen the turtle? If this was intentional, would the presence of other night time users served as a deterrent? I submit that the answer to the latter is a resounding YES. This statement is based upon past experience. Furthermore, anglers that regularly frequent the beaches at dawn have helped notified park service resource personnel of nests missed by the morning patrols. Quite simply, the night time ban on ORV use has been counterproductive.

## Summary

Despite the costs (i.e. the mass killing of wildlife thereby threatening the natural balance between predators and prey, adding nearly \$600,000 to the NPS resource management bill, and taking actions that have contributed to a 17.4% decline in visitation and stressed the local economy), new management policies have NOT resulted in improved productivity numbers for Piping Plovers, have NOT halted the decline in the Oystercatcher population, and have NOT benefited Sea Turtles.

Despite this lack of success, the DOI/NPS plan to expand upon the previous unsuccessful efforts to boost shorebird productivity/populations and protect sea turtles. The estimated cost of the new resource protection efforts is nearly \$3 million dollars per year. This figure represents a 4-fold increase over 2004 resource management and a 2-fold increase over Interim Plan resource management and protection costs.

With respect to cost to the local economy, the NPS continues to write off the cost to the local community. RTI does make note of the significant impact on local businesses but then perpetuates past practice of defining the ROI so broadly as to negate the recognized impacts on the local economy. Finally, RTI ignores existing data and instead substitutes unreliable estimates of cost and a model that does not take into account the unique characteristics of the local economy to estimate future costs. Actually, RTI recognizes the limitation of their data and models when they state that calculating quantitative estimates was not possible. Instead RTI chooses to provide "a qualitative ranking of the action alternatives relative to the no-action alternatives for the different categories of benefits and costs."

As I demonstrated above, we DO have reliable data as to the cost of the more aggressive policies that have been implement over the past 7 years--that is, a 17.4% decline in visitation, considerable dissatisfaction with opportunities to use park resources, and an erosion of the relationship between the park service and the local community. RTI and the NPS simply chose to ignore it.

With respect to what we can expect of the proposed rule and expanded protection efforts, comments from the DEIS/FEIS demonstrate that this trend in user dissatisfaction and tension between the community and the park service will continue to increase. In some cases businesses have refused to serve park personnel and anti-Audubon signs are being brandished on billboards.

With respect to the costs to the economy, Cape Cod National Seashore can provide some insight. Cape Cod National Seashore is similar to Cape Hatteras National Seashore in that they derive a good deal of their tourist income from park visitation. In 1996, following the implementation of similar efforts at Cape Cod visitation fell by 10% and has remained at that lower level. Insofar as the villages of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands are surrounded by park service property and are considerably smaller in terms of land mass available for private enterprise, there are less non park related activities available and it is quite likely that the decrease in visitation will exceed the 10% observed at Cape Cod.

As for the impact on the local economy, Cape Cod's economic base did contract with many businesses that catered to park visitors closing entirely and others scaling way back. As RTI notes, however, communities with a larger economic base are better able to absorb impact for reduced visitation than smaller economies who depend more directly on park visitation. The latter is a description of the 8 villages of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands that have a total population of 4,000. What did RTI have to say about the potential costs to such small communities? That they will experience major economic impacts. How major? Data from Cape Cod on business contractions and closings for businesses that relied directly on park visitation would provide a base line. This data along with a reasonable multiplier could have been used to project to forecast rates of business failures and loss of income due to reduced park visitation for Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

The most egregious nature of all this is that the NPS/DOI "ensured" that the local economy would be "exclusively" dependent upon park visitation when the NPS/DOI "insisted" on acquiring all the land surrounding the villages on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands and thereby limited the amount of land available for village expansion. The NPS has to know that this plan will substantially change the lives of the 4,000 residents of the villages on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands, causing many residents to leave the Islands and resulting in a much lower standard of living for those residents who remain. Yet the DOI asserts that "this document will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities under the RFA (5 U.S.C. 601 et

seq.)" and the OMB has asserted that "This rule will not have an effect of \$100 million or more on the economy. It will not adversely affect in a material way the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or Tribal governments or communities."

With respect to the benchmark of \$100 million, you could shut down the entire rental industry on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands and not reach this figure. As such you must look to the relative impacts. In this regard, the population of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands totals a mere 4,000 and have an average per capita income of only \$40,000. Furthermore, as per RTI, "Almost all of the businesses in the Seashore villages are small." and rely directly on park service visitation. These business have already endured 7 years of losses associated with a 17.4% decline in park visitation. And, as I have demonstrated above stand to endure at least another 10% decline as a result of this new rule. Even RTI admits that there will be a significant impact on businesses that rely directly on park visitation in areas impacted by the new rule which includes every village on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. This being the case, the only way the DOI and the OMB can possible assert that the economic impact will not be material is if they have been mislead or if they have chosen to turn a blind eye to reality.

#### Recommended Solution

As I stated at the start of this comment, the DOI and the OMB should require that the park service rescind the record of decision, redo the socio economic analysis using data available as opposed to using questionable data and erroneous models using a more appropriate ROI, and resubmit the FEIS for public comment. The preferred alternative should be the Interim Plan.

With respect to the Interim Plan, as evidenced by facts

1. that there was no final adjunction or admission of the violations claimed by SELC, et al as they related to the Interim Plan, 2. that there were no negative impacts on managed species either during the implementation of the prototype of the Interim Plan in 2005 & 2006 or the first year of the full implementation of the Interim Plan (2007), 3. that the more aggressive management approach used in 2008 through 2011 did not result in any marked improvement for managed species, and 4. that the Interim Plan triggers and buffers are consistent with the triggers and buffers utilized at other seashores,

there is NO basis for proposing a rule that relies on a whole host of infrastructure improvements and that reduces access to over-utilized ORV areas while increasing access to under-utilized VFAs. Furthermore, continuation of the Interim Plan would leave twice as much room for visitors of all types to spread out thus, would add to the variety of experiences available to visitors and would minimize the potential for crowding and user conflicts without denying visitors access. As such, implementation of the Interim Plan will fulfill the requirements of section 3 of the E.O.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12979    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12980    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

Cape Hatteras is a beautiful place where many people and their families and friends go to enjoy the scenery and wilderness. I am glad to hear that regulations on beach driving are finally being adopted in the area, but am concerned at the unrestricted offroad vehicle usage that is allowed to take place. While off-roading is certainly a fun and exciting endeavor, if unrestricted, will eliminate many reasons why the cape is such a popular place to visit. ORVs can cause significant damage to the nesting bird populations and other wildlife that utilize the beach, and I encourage you to develop strict regulation in limiting off road vehicle usage to maximize the chances of survival of wildlife species in the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12981    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape

Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	12982	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Re: Comment Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Cape Hatteras National Seashore						

"This rule complies With the requirements of E.O. 12988. Specifically, this rule: (a) Meets the criteria of section 3(a) requiring that all regulations be reviewed to eliminate errors and ambiguity and be written to minimize litigation; and (b) Meets the criteria of section 3(b)(2) requiring that all regulations be written in clear language and contain clear legal standards."

Did anyone at the DOI, OMB, or any other supervising agency read this rule, or the 2 1/2" thick color glossy FEIS on which the rule is based, or the 1 1/2" thick color glossy addendum of comments outlining various positions and concerns? These documents are fraught with inconsistencies, ambiguities, errors, and vague language. See Appendix A for a discussion of deficiencies in the proposed rule.

With respect to writing the rule to minimize litigation, the park service should be commended for their efforts. In order to justify their efforts to placate SELC, et al, the park service has rewritten history ignoring the importance of tourism. Furthermore the park service makes it appear as if beach driving to engage in recreational activities prior to the establishment of the seashore did not occur. In fact, the description of beach driving that appears in the proposed rule is so vague that it is possible to interpret ORV use as a "new" activity and this rule as a rule designed to authorize this "new" use. See Appendix B for a discussion of how the park service has rewritten history.

Furthermore, the park service has written the proposed rule so as dramatically understated the importance of ORV use as it exists today and overstate the need for more vehicle free areas. As such the rule actually reduces the variety of visitor experiences, creates crowding issues, and increases the likelihood of visitor conflicts thus, the rule violates section 3 of the 1972 & 1977 executive orders. See Appendix C for a complete discussion of impact of the proposed rule on visitor use.

Finally, the park service has presented a cost benefit analysis that overstates the benefits to non ORV users and wildlife. At the same time, the park service ignores the cost to the local economy (that of the 8 villages that depend almost exclusively on park visitation) and the impact on the village residents' quality of life. See Appendix D for a discussion of the costs and benefits associated with the rule.

Will the park's efforts to placate SELC, et al be successful? I submit that the answer is NO. This conclusion is based upon past litigation history presented in Appendix E. Another indication that the park service's heroic efforts will NOT prevent litigation can be found in the transcripts and public comments submitted by SELC, et al. These comments make it clear that SELC, et al believe that the alternative on which the proposed rule is based allows far too much ORV use and far too little wildlife/habitat protection.

So what does SELC, et al want? SELC, et al has made it clear that they feel the organic act should be interpreted with the greatest emphasis being placed on permanently reserving the park "as a primitive wilderness and no development of the project of 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." In this regard SELC, et al has repeatedly made it clear that the only way to fulfill the requirements of the organic act is to restore natural processes. This is not just empty rhetoric. SELC, et al has acted on their desire to see natural processes restored. For example, consider the fact SELC, et al has filed a letter of intent objecting the replacement of the Bonner Bridge. SELC's main complaints do not revolve around the bridge. Instead their concerns focus on the required maintenance of Highway 12, the power lines that span Pea Island, and maintenance of the dunes. All of these, they say, interfere with the natural processes and are destroying the habitat. Ironically, the dune construction program of 1935 was designed to create dunes but rather was "designed to mitigate the impacts of storms, deforestation, and overgrazing." That is, the dunes were part of the natural environment prior to the dune construction effort. Pea Islands impoundments and wetlands, however, are all manmade but I don't see SELC calling for their removal.

As further evidence of how far SELC, et al is willing to take their efforts to ensure the restoration of natural processes, consider the events following Hurricane Isabel in 2003. The hurricane breeched the island just north of Hatteras Village. SELC, et al expressed the view that filling the breach interfered with the natural process of inlet creation. SELC, et al was partly responsible for the delay in repairing the breach and restoring vital services to Hatteras Village. More recently, in November of 2010, when

a Nor'easter took out a portion of Highway 12 at Mirlo Beach, representatives from SELC, et al were present and made sure that the repair did not go "one inch" beyond the current right of way. Never mind that the park service has allowed a rolling right of way or that residents had been without access to supplies and vital services for 3 days. Then we have Hurricane Irene which breeched 4 spots on Pea Island 8/27. As of this point Hatteras Island residents' access to the mainland is limited to a ferry from Rodanthe to Stumpy Point which can only be run when the tide conditions are just right. Hatteras Island villages are either without power or have the power supplied by backup diesel generators. Ocracoke Island will not have power for a week and now one will be reconnected to the grid until highway 12 on Pea Island is repaired. Likewise transportation corridor will not be reopened until highway 12 on Pea Island and the Bonner Bridge are reopened. So what is SELC, et al doing? Already SELC, et al and USFWS are objecting to the reconstruction of the infrastructure. This is unconscionable.

So exactly what does SELC, et al see as the future for Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands? Given that SELC, et al has continually referred S.R. Riggs, I submit that they share Riggs' view of the future as outlined below.

"If we withdrew from some of the coastal highways and terminated the construction of barrier dune ridges, the islands would begin their natural rebirth as inlet and overwash dynamics would once more rebuild them. The eventual result would likely be a barrier island system with eight Ocracoke-style destination villages (Fig. 23) strung like a string of pearls upon a vast network of inlet and shoal environments that would afford us many new opportunities for economic development."

According to Riggs, the 4,000 residents of the villages would support themselves by providing "water taxis, muletrain and ATV tours, fishing and hunting guides" and develop into a new eco-tourism economy. Travel between Villages could be achieved via "inter-connected by a system of modern ferry and water-taxi systems (jet-powered catamarans and hydrofoils) capable of moving large volumes of visitors rapidly to and between destination villages with minimal disturbance to ecosystems. Supply trucks, tourist buses, garbage trucks, SUVs, and personal vehicles of the village residents could be transported using the NC DOT ferry system or hovercraft similar to those used by the U.S. Marine Corps. 11. Ferry terminals could be located at the small rural mainland villages such as Wachese, Stumpy Point, Engelhard, Swan Quarter, and Cedar Island (Fig. 23). These towns could maintain short- and long-term car parks, allowing tourists in the destination villages to utilize less invasive types of transport systems (e.g., bikes, golf carts, pedi-cabs, trolleys, mule-trains, etc.) Mainland towns would be in a position to develop many local businesses (e.g., motels, restaurants, Band Bs, service stations, etc.) and become centers for new natural resource-oriented business opportunities (e.g., guiding and supplying eco-tours of the Outer Banks and mainland Inner Banks (e.g., black-water paddle and camping trips, estuarine cruising trips, coastal over-flight field trips, historical tours, hunting-fishing-birding tours, etc.)."

Riggs never considers the costs of the grandiose plans. Riggs never talks about where modern communication lines or electric lines will be placed or the cost associated with providing such services. Riggs never talks about the possible delay in gaining access to critical services. Nonetheless, SELC, et al has bought into Riggs' vision of the future demonstrating once again their lack of concern for the human residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands.

What does all this mean for the potential for litigation? Obviously, SELC, et al can't lobby for the abandonment of Highway 12 between the villages or the abandonment of dunes that protect the highway. They can and have lobbied for the abandonment of the Bonner Bridge and Highway 12 on Pea Island. They have advocated for a ferry from Oregon Inlet to Rodanthe. SELC, et al never talks about how the residents of the 8 villages of Hatteras and Ocracoke islands with a per capita income of \$40,000 will afford the higher cost of electricity and supplies. SELC, et al never talks about the fact that a ferry had proved inadequate as a means of supporting the level of visitation that existed in 1956. There is good reason SELC, et al doesn't discuss the past shortcomings of ferry service because if they did they would have to admit that ferry service is not a practical solution. This has been proven during the past several days when an emergency ferry landing in Rodanthe has not been able to run at low tide. Frankly, despite SELC, et al assurances that they don't wish the residents harm, it is obvious they just don't care.

Based upon the above, it should come as no surprised that within 2 days of the devastation wrought by Hurricane Irene SELC, et al has, once again, lobbied for abandonment instead of repair/replacement of the infrastructure. Furthermore, each future storm, each future review of the FEIS, each future review of the ORV rule, etc. will be met with new challenges and new litigation. The only way to stop the cycle is for the park service, the DOI, the OMB, etc. to stop trying to placate SELC, et al and other similar environmental groups.

#### Recommended Solution

I respectfully request that you write a realistic rule that satisfies the EO. Stated more specifically, the EO does NOT require a more restrictive regulation. The EO DOES require that "the designation of such areas and trails will be based upon the protection of the resources of the public lands, promotion of the safety of all users of those lands, and minimization of conflicts among the various uses of those lands." This can and should be based upon existing infrastructure and long established ORV corridors and routes. As such, I respectfully request that you implement Alternative A (2007 FOSNI Interim Strategy) and codify the ORV Management Policies contained therein. With respect to the Interim Plan, as evidenced by facts

1. that there was no final adjunction or admission of the violations claimed by SELC, et al as they related to the Interim Plan, 2. that there were no negative impacts on managed species either during the implementation of the prototype of the Interim Plan in 2005 & 2006 or the first year of the full implementation of the Interim Plan (2007), 3. that the more aggressive management approach used in 2008 through 2011 did not result in any marked improvement for managed species, and 4. that the Interim Plan triggers and buffers are consistent with the triggers and buffers utilized at other seashores,

there is NO basis for proposing a rule that relies on a whole host of infrastructure improvements and that reduces access to over-utilized ORV areas while increasing access to under-utilized VFAs. Furthermore, continuation of the Interim Plan would leave twice as much room for visitors of all types to spread out thus, would add to the variety of experiences available to visitors and would minimize the potential for crowding and user conflicts without denying visitors access. As such, implementation of the Interim Plan will fulfill the requirements of section 3 of the E.O.

The Interim Plan is legally defensible and if you don't draw a line in the sand you will be back in court every few years. To minimize the threat of a successful challenge from the environmental groups, I request that the NPS reconsider the decision not to designate Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area as Traditional Cultural Properties. In this regard Mr. Murray made his original determination based upon the opinion that beach driving had been practiced for fewer than 50 years. In this rule, Mr. Murray acknowledges that beach driving has been practiced since at least 1937 (74 years) but states that beach driving was primarily for the purpose of transportation, not recreation. I have supplied ample evidence that beach driving for the purposes of engaging in recreational activities has been common place since at least 1920--32 years prior to the establishment of Cape Hatteras National Recreational Area in 1953 and at least 91 years in total. I have also provided ample evidence that a thriving tourist-based economy existed well before the park was established and that concerns that the park would limit continued expansion or even fail to sustain the existing economy nearly resulted in the failure to complete the land acquisition required to satisfy the enabling legislation of 1937. Its time to stop placating the environmentalists' and do what is right for the good people of Hatters and Ocracoke Islands, the alternative is a slow death of the villages and ruination of the lives of the 4,000 residents of these Islands many of whom can date their lineage back to the Croatoan Indians that inhabited these islands and the first English settlers who intermingled with the Croatoan Indians of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. Finally, for added insurance the DOI could request Congress pass legislation reaffirming the original intent to preserve "public access to free beaches, especially for 'people of low income groups'" and the original plan to "encourage park development near the villages for the convenience of the public, to promote village growth, and to concentrate development so to leave miles of beach front undisturbed." by park development. This is appropriate because the implementation of the park service plan created the unique relationship between the park and the village residents. A relationship that has resulting in making the residents completely dependent upon the park service. This has been purposed but put aside due to other more pressing matters like the budget debates. It must be brought back to the floor again.

#### APPENDIX A--Deficiencies in the Proposed Rule

The DOI asserts that "this document will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities under the RFA (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)." and the OMB has asserted that "This rule will not have an effect of \$100 million or more on the economy. It will not adversely affect in a material way the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or Tribal governments or communities."

At the same time, the proposed rule takes note of the fact that "100 percent of the rule's impacts would fall on small businesses." The rationale for the conclusion that the rule will not have a material impact on the economy is as follows:

"The proposed rule includes a number of measures designed to mitigate effect on the number of visitors as well as the potential for indirect economic effects on village businesses that profit from patronage by Seashore visitors using ORVs. These include: New pedestrian and ORV beach access points, parking areas, pedestrian trails, routes between dunes, and ORV ramps to enhance ORV and pedestrian access; a designated year-round ORV route at Cape Point and South Point, subject to resource closures when breeding activity occurs; and pedestrian shoreline access along ocean and inlet shorelines adjacent to shorebird pre-nesting areas until breeding activity is observed. In addition, we will seek funding for an alternative transportation study and consider applications for businesses to offer beach and water shuttle services. These extra efforts to increase overall access and visitor use under the Selected Action, which we developed with extensive public involvement, should increase the probability that the economic impacts are on the low rather than high end of the range."

The above description of efforts to mitigate economic impact is not accurate. For example, the year round ORV routes at Cape Point and South Point are not new thus, they do nothing to mitigate the effect on visitors. Similarly, the pedestrian shoreline access is not new thus, does nothing to mitigate the effect on visitors.

With respect to the list of infrastructure improvements, there has been absolutely no evidence of progress on any of the above infrastructure improvements. This being the case, how does the park service expect to have these improvements in place by November 15 when the permit portion of the rule goes into effect? I submit that the implementation of the permit without the specified infrastructure improvements is a violation of the rule.

With respect to the permit itself, the proposed rule does not specify the amount of the permit fee. As such, it is impossible to determine the impact of the proposed permit. For example, a nominal fee will have much less impact than a fee of say \$150 to \$200. Fewer visitors or residents will be able to justify the latter, especially since the permit fee will not guarantee access to the park's beaches. Without any estimate of the permit fee, the proposed rule is not complete.

Finally, the proposed rule is not realistic. As I have demonstrated in my comment on cost benefit analysis, RTI and the park service ignored the realities of the costs and the benefits derived from more aggressive resource management. Similarly, RTI and the park service have failed to provide any quantitative estimate of the future impacts of the ORV rule. Furthermore, the infrastructure improvements listed in the rule are not likely to be funded and cannot possibly be completed by the implementation date set for the permit. In fact, in this economic/political climate it is extremely unlikely that the park service will receive funding for the infrastructure improvements. This being the case and since, the projected impacts are based upon

completion of the infrastructure improvements the projected impacts will almost certainly be more significant than projected.

#### APPENDIX B--Rewrite of History, Tourism and Beach Driving

"Following the establishment of the Seashore in 1937, beach driving was primarily for the purpose of transportation, not recreation.

Because the area was sparsely populated, the number of ORVs on the beach was much smaller than it is today.

The paving of NC Highway 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."

The above suggests that beach driving did not exist prior to 1937. Really? Were there no vehicles? Vehicles were in widespread use elsewhere, so is the park service suggesting that there were no people prior to 1937? As evidenced by the fact that the first recorded vehicle accident on Hatteras Island was 1920, there were BOTH people and vehicles before 1937.

Subsequent to 1937, the park service recognizes ORV use on the park's beaches but insists these vehicles were not used to engage in recreational activities. Really? I will demonstrate that beach driving for the purpose of engaging in recreational activities is a planned extension of the trend that was already evolving before the authorization of the park in 1937 and which continued long before the establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in 1953 NOT 1937.

Finally, the park service states that improved access resulting from the completion of Highway 12, the Bonner Bridge, and the Ocracoke Ferry in combination with "increased population, and the popularity of the sport utility vehicle have resulted in a dramatic increase in vehicle use on Seashore beaches." If beach driving had not been for the purpose of recreation and if beach driving was no longer required for transportation because of infrastructure improvements, then why did beach driving increase? I submit that the Federal Register description of beach driving is not accurate. For example, I will demonstrate that beach driving for the purpose of in engaging in recreation not only began prior to 1953 but was and still is supported by the park service.

Based upon the above, I submit that the park service has mischaracterized beach driving for recreational purposes as a "new" activity so as to justify a rule that requires a vast array of new infrastructure. Furthermore, characterizing beach driving as a "new" activity allows the park service to propose a rule that changes to long established ORV corridors and routes without having to prove that the established corridors and trails are "necessary to protect the resource, promote safety and minimize conflicts."

Establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area was 1953 not 1937

The 1937 Act of Congress authorized the establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area on North Carolina's Outer Banks. This act did not establish Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area but rather set the requirements for the park, including the acquisition of 62,000 acres (10,000 minimum) to be completed within a 10 year period. As of 1946 the acquisition was far from complete and land acquisition was discontinued. In 1946 Congress extended this deadline to 1952. With the new deadline fast approaching, the Secretary of the Interior agreed to reduce the size of the project to 28,500 acres. As of January 1953 Secretary Chapman was still far short of the smaller project. Rather than go to Congress and ask for another extension of the deadline for land acquisition or reducing the size of the project, Secretary Chapman proceeded to issue an order for the NPS to take control of the 12,414 acres that had been acquired. It is this order that marks the official establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area and allowed for deployment of the first permanent NPS personnel in May 1953.

Tourism and Beach Driving Trends from 1935 to 1957

Contrary to the Federal Register description of beach driving, the FEIS on which the rule is based characterizes beach driving in the following fashion:

"Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides a variety of visitor experiences. It is a long, essentially linear park, visitation is high, and parking spaces near roads are limited. Some popular beach sites, particularly those near the inlets and Cape Point, are a distance from established or possible parking spaces. Visitors who come for some popular recreational activities such as surf fishing and picnicking are accustomed to using large amounts and types of recreational equipment that cannot practically be hauled over these distances by most visitors without some form of motorized access. For many visitors, the time needed and the physical challenge of hiking to the distant sites, or for some even to close sites, can discourage or preclude access by nonmotorized means. As a result, 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."

This is the most accurate description of beach driving that I have seen. This description of beach driving applies not only to today but applies to the nature of beach driving long before the establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational

Area in 1953. In fact, tourism and beach driving for the purposes of engaging in recreational activities was established practice before Congress authorized Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area in 1937. For example, as per the following statement made by Lindsay Warren, tourism was well established in 1935.

"Conservatively speaking, this area is the greatest game and fishing spot on the American continent. Visitors go there almost the year round from every section of the nation, and just 18 miles off Hatteras is the Gulf Stream with its unrivaled fishing."

How did visitors get here in 1935? How did they travel the "long, essentially linear" beaches to get to the inlets and Cape Point to partake in the fishing spot in 1935? The park documents the mode of transportation in this picture. What did visitors find when they got here in 1935? Where did they get supplies, where did they stay, who provided services, etc. in 1935? In 1935, visitors found an established population of around 1,600 to 1,800 spread among 8 villages on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands that were evolving from fishing villages into a modern tourist economy.

Between 1935 and 1941, the population and the tourist economy continued to grow. During this period, as part of the new deal, the government engaged in dune construction designed to mitigate the impacts of storms, deforestation, and overgrazing. The existence of the dunes did not stop beach driving as a means of engaging in recreational activities. Instead commercial fisherman would cut make-shift ramps in the dunes. These make-shift ramps were also used by the general public. For example, see the 1947 video Van Campen Heilner surf fishing film.

By 1952 a road was completed from Oregon Inlet to Rodanthe, land values had skyrocketed, and "tourist courts and hotels were already going up in the villages, including one built on land shown by maps to be state property and once seen as a possible donation." That is, the tourist economy was thriving and the residents of the villages were none to sure about the impact of a park that would "surround" the villages creating islands of development entirely dependent upon park service management policies. The village residents protested the creation of the park and challenged DOI condemnations of their land. The residents feared their economic development would be hampered by government regulations and too little land. Additionally, the park had refused to allow the continuation of highway 12 south of Rodanthe. The residents saw this roadway as necessary to sustain the growth of the tourist based economy. The residents also feared that they would loose beach access (hunting had already been narrowly defined and there had been rumblings about restricting beach driving thus it is clear that access meant beach driving). In the end the park service recognized that it had to accept the villages. In fact Superintendent Hanks recommended the development of a roadway along the entire length of the park. Hanks plans "encouraged park development near the villages for the convenience of the public, to promote village growth, and to concentrate development so to leave miles of beach front undisturbed." by park development. Both of these recommendations were ultimately included in the Mission 66 Prospectus which would serve as the guideline for park development.

Subsequent to the approval of the Mission 66 Prospectus in 1956, beach driving not only continued but was supported by the NPS with 6 road ramps constructed in 1957 as part of a dune restoration project 6.

Furthermore, while the government was still in the process of acquiring land, before the park was dedicated in 1958, and 7 years before the completion of highway 12 and the Bonner Bridge, tourism levels were large enough to cause significant traffic jams at Oregon Inlet.

Despite this level of tourism, beach driving for purpose of engaging in recreational activities, as practiced between the 1930s until well into the 1960s, resulted in few complaints or conflicts between vehicle-users and other beach-goers. In fact, despite this level of tourism and beach driving for purposes of engaging in recreational activities, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Roger Ernst stated that the "Outer Banks were judged particularly desirable because of their great potential for public use." He further noted that the park was to be "the first of a new class of national park that safeguarded the seashore from extensive development while guaranteeing the American public unencumbered access to beaches". In the final assessment this new model was judged to be "greatly successful in achieving the essential vision and aims of its founders." In fact, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area became an "important model for subsequent similar parks around the country."

In summary, contrary to the characterization of beach driving presented in the proposed rule, automobile driving for the purposes of engaging in recreational activities was common place prior to the establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Furthermore, beach driving for the purposes of engaging in recreational activities continued long after the establishment of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area and did not result in significant complaints from other users. Finally, this activity was supported by the NPS. Nonetheless, the park service does not attempt to justify the need for changing long established corridors and ORV routes and the added infrastructure needed to implement the proposed rule.  
APPENDIX C--Impact on Visitor Use

"The proposed rule would authorize ORV use at the Seashore, manage it to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources and natural processes, and provide a variety of safe visitor experiences while minimizing conflicts among various users."

In point of fact, the proposed rule expands the park's most under utilized areas (vehicle free areas) while reducing areas (ORV areas) that have become so congested under the consent decree that it nearly impossible to engage in many popular activities (i.e. fishing, surfing, or any other activity that require some elbow room). This, in combination with unprecedented approaches to resource management and a wide range of new restrictions on visitor use, will dramatically reduce the shoreline available for visitor use, severely limit the variety of access opportunities available for ALL visitors, and increase the potential for conflicts among users in the areas that remain open to recreational use. This being case, this rule violates section 3 of the E.O.

## Unprecedented Approaches to Resource Management

Alternative F proposes a new designation, namely Species Management Areas. Species Management Areas are designed to minimize "human disturbance" and are based upon habitat and species use patterns observed during the past 5 years. The only option for early review of designated Species Management Areas is if species management goals are not achieved or if weather events alter the habitat. If either of these events occur the proposal calls for expansion of the Species Management Areas to facilitate recovery of populations or to take advantage of newly created habitat. The end result of this new approach to species management is to mandate the closure of a minimum 13-16 miles of beach for the both Spring and Summer seasons, even if habitat becomes unsuitable or species fail to use the area.

Alternative F defines an unprecedented standard for species management outside of the Species Management Areas--namely, ML1. ML1 protocols use "larger, longer-lasting buffers" to protect wildlife. While it is not possible to predict the number of miles that will be closed by these unprecedented protocols, it is possible to use the pattern of closures that have resulted from the past two years of management under the consent decree to make a fairly accurate estimate of potential closures. A review of the Beach Access reports for 2008 and 2009 shows a pattern of wide-spread full-beach resource closures spanning the period of 5/15 to 8/15. Based upon the fact that the predicted ML1 closures will be added to the mandated Species Management Area closures, it is more than likely that the resource management proposal will relegate access for ALL visitors to either the high density village front beaches or 15 miles of shoreline spread over 10 areas. The length of the shoreline available in these 10 areas will likely range from as little as 1/2 mile beach parking lots to a maximum of 2.7 miles. In effect, the resource management proposal will likely turn the beaches available outside of the village fronts into virtual parking lots with the only opportunity for a remote experience being relegated to pedestrian day use at Pea Island. Furthermore, by reducing access areas to such small spaces, the potential for overcrowding and user conflicts will increase dramatically.

## New Restrictions on Visitor Use

The ORV management proposal sets a peak use limit and adds an ORV permit requirement. The fee associated with the proposed ORV permit will be set to recover the cost associated with ORV management. Neither the proposed rule nor the FEIS provide any estimate of the cost of a permit. Depending upon the cost and recognizing that the purchase of a permit will not guarantee access if the peak use limit has been reached, it is very possible that many visitors will be unable to justify an expenditure for something they may not be able to use. Ironically, Hatteras and Ocracoke Island residents who provide support services to the park visitors and with average incomes below \$40,000 will be the hardest hit by the permit fee and will be least likely to find a beach not full up by the time they get off of work or on weekends.

Other new restrictions on visitor use include restricting or eliminating access to productive off season fishing grounds and time restrictions that preclude access during the most productive fishing hours. These hours are also the least crowded times of day thus reduce the possibility of user conflicts. Also, opportunities for night sky viewing, beach fires, and a wide range of other early evening or night time activities will be sharply curtailed. The new restrictions will have the biggest impact on the shoulder season activities such as surf fishing (Hatteras Island is home to the world record Red Drum landing and the worlds largest saltwater fishing tournament) and water sports (i.e. surfing, kite boarding, etc.). Finally, the time restrictions will make it impossible for the working resident to access the beach before or after work or at night as has been custom since long before the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area was even suggested. Limiting the leisure time options of low income residents of the Island villages which exist as islands surrounded by Park Service property and Pamlico Sound and are totally dependent traditional access to the park's beaches is unconscionable. As evidenced by the following statements made by former Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes and Assistant Secretary of the Interior Roger Ernst, this rule runs counter to NPS's original intent to preserve "public access to free beaches, especially for 'people of low income groups'".

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

20 years later, Secretary Ickes' vision was reaffirmed during the dedication of the park when Roger Ernst Assistant Secretary of the Interior stated that the "Outer Banks were judged particularly desirable because of their great potential for public use." That is, the park was to be "the first of a new class of national park that safeguarded the seashore from extensive development while guaranteeing the American public unencumbered access to beaches". In the final assessment this new model was judged to be "greatly successful in achieving the essential vision and aims of its founders." In fact, Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area became an "important model for subsequent similar parks around the country."

Even the current FEIS recognizes the importance and long standing nature of beach driving for recreation.

"Cape Hatteras National Seashore provides a variety of visitor experiences. It is a long, essentially linear park, visitation is high, and parking spaces near roads are limited. Some popular beach sites, particularly those near the inlets and Cape Point, are a distance from established or possible parking spaces. Visitors who come for some popular recreational activities such as surf fishing and picnicking are accustomed to using large amounts and types of recreational equipment that cannot practically be hauled over these distances by most visitors without some form of motorized access. For many visitors, the time needed and the physical challenge of hiking to the distant sites, or for some even to close sites, can discourage or preclude access by



nonmotorized means. As a result, 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."

Unfortunately, recreational access to national seashores has been eroded by Environmentalists' demands with only Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area and Padre Island retaining "some" of the characteristics originally envisioned for this class of park. We have many protected seashore areas up and down the east and west coast. And while protection of wildlife is necessary, there is also a need to retain areas where mankind can go to recreate and get away from the rigors of modern life. Two such areas, one east coast and one west coast park reserved for the originally intended purpose of preserving "public access to free beaches, especially for 'people of low income groups'" is not too much to ask—it is as the President says a "balanced" approach. APPENDIX D--Cost/Benefit Analysis

The DEIS was published on March 12, 2010. The FEIS was published on November 11, 2010. The record of decision to adopt the FEIS was published on December 20, 2010. The cost benefit analysis on which the DEIS, FEIS, and the record of decision were based was published on July 6, 2011.

This timing of the above events denied the public any opportunity to comment on the cost benefit analysis. Even more disturbing is the fact that the DEIS and the FEIS were written without having a completed cost benefit analysis in hand. I submit that the DEIS and the FEIS conclusions were written in advance and the cost benefit analysis was written to support the conclusions presented in the DEIS and FEIS. Finally, as I will demonstrate below the cost benefit analysis effectively ignores the impact on the residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands, the economies of which are dependent upon visitation to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Based on these facts, I call upon the park service to rescind the record of decision, to redo the socio economic analysis using data available as opposed to using questionable data and erroneous models, and to resubmit the FEIS for public comment.

#### RTI INTERNATIONAL COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

There are three flaws in the RTI International cost benefit analysis. The first is the definition of the ROI. In the Interim Plan, the park service defined the ROI as Outer Banks Dare and Hyde Counties. Comments demonstrated that this broad definition of the ROI served to minimize the impact on the 4,000 residents of the 8 villages of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands with economies that are dependent upon park visitation. RTI International used the same flawed definition of the ROI as was used by the park service in the Interim Plan. As evidenced by the statements presented below, using a wider ROI guaranteed the same result as achieved in the Interim Plan—that is, major negative impacts to the residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands would be summarily dismissed.

"The impacts will have the largest impact on businesses in the Seashore villages. Visitors to other parts of the Dare County generally use the beaches in the northern part of the Outer Banks, which are outside the Seashore. Almost all of the businesses in the Seashore villages are small. Small businesses have a harder time absorbing revenue losses and there may be individual businesses that experience major impacts."

The business impacts will fall most heavily on the Seashore villages and on small businesses. Some businesses north of the Seashore will be impacted by changes in ORV use; however, the impact on the villages north of the Seashore will be cushioned by the larger economic base of visitors who come primarily to use the beaches north of the Seashore. The Seashore villages depend most directly on visitors to the Seashore. Even if the overall impacts on Dare and Hyde counties or on the Seashore villages as a whole turn out to be smaller than anticipated, some individual businesses that depend on visitors to a particular beach access ramp may experience major impacts."

The second flaw involves the data RTI International used for its analysis. The ranges reported to achieve a 95 percent confidence interval clearly demonstrate that the estimates are based upon flawed sample data.

Third, RTI International used the a model to forecast economic impact that cannot possibly reflect the realities of the situation. The model used does not reflect the unique geography of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands and the resultant lack of close substitutes for employment and leisure. With respect to geography, the 8 villages are surrounded either by park owned property or Pamlico Sound—each village is an island with the park being the sea. As such, the primary source of economic activity is park visitation. As per Superintendent Hanks' input into the Mission 66 plan for development, the park service fully expected to create this type of dependency and to support the village economies rather than create new development within the seashore.

The current reality is that the villages exist at the discretion of the park service. For example, consider the current Bonner Bridge controversy. The park service holds title to Pea Island but delegates management to USFWS. The replacement of the bridge has been blocked by USFWS for 18 years because USFWS does not want to continue to allow maintenance of Highway 12 and the power lines that supply electricity to the villages. Without the bridge and the road, residents will find it extremely difficult to gain access to the mainland. Without the bridge and road, it was impossible to sustain visitation and the economy at 1963 levels, let alone at today's levels. Bottom line, the model used does not allow for a closed economy such as the one that exists on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. As I will demonstrate below the costs of the proposed rule are substantial while the benefits are minimal.

#### COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS

## Summary of Resource Management Strategies and Costs

Over the years CHNSRA resources have been managed under a variety of plans. These plans are summarized below.

Management Policies Annual Resource Management Cost1 Percentage Change over 2004 Annual Protection Cost1 Percentage Change over Interim Plan 1992-2003 Management N/A N/A N/A N/A 2004 Management -- Superintendent's Order 07:ORV Management \$ 223,349 N/A N/A N/A Interim Plan Prototype & Interim Plan (2005-2007) \$ 508,500 228% \$ 1,147,500 N/A Consent Decree (2008-2010) \$ 813,000 364% \$ 1,481,500 129% FEIS \$ 943,950 423% \$ 1,956,100 170% 1 2004 Management Costs as per Interim Plan, Interim Plan and Consent Decree Costs as per FEIS.

The cost of the recent resource management policies are due in part to a more proactive approach to shorebird protection. The cost increases reflect increased monitoring with daily reports of every single nesting bird and chick. The cost increases also reflect increased predator control--every bird and animal that dares to come near historic nesting areas must run a gambit of leg hold traps. These traps have killed and/or injured other species of concern (Diamondback Terrapins) and even domestic animals. And if a favored bird (Piping Plover, Oystercatcher, or Colonial Waterbird) finds itself in distress, the NPS will either transfer the bird to long term care (2010 Oystercatcher report) or administer antibiotics/steroids on site (conversation with turtle patrol).

While the NPS resource management costs are a matter of record, little has been done to document the impact of the more aggressive management policies that have been implemented over the past 7 years. These policies have sharply reduced the options available to park visitors. For example, under the 1992-2003 Management policy resource closures were erected to protect nests, rarely interfered with access, and never prevented through traffic between ORV ramps. This is NO longer true. Under current management, resource closures are erected NOT simply to protect nests but rather are based upon previous nests and "courtship" behavior, thus resource closures begin as early as mid March. Resource closures are larger and almost always extend to the shoreline. Finally, resource closures for turtle nests extend the time line for restricted access well into October. The end result is that an average of 25-30% of the shoreline is closed to "all" users and 65-70% of ORV use areas are closed. Through traffic between ORV ramps is a thing of the past and access points are frequently closed to "all" users, making them parking lots to nowhere. Finally, from May 1 to September 15, ORV access is limited to 6 am through 10 pm. This time restriction effectively shuts down spring and fall game fishing and shuts down the dawn and dusk time frames serious anglers cherish.

Rather than attempt to determine the impact of the above noted restrictions, RTI International simply assumes that less ORV use is a positive for all visitors other than those who utilize ORVs and for wildlife. As I will demonstrate below the positive impacts on wildlife have not been realized.

With respect to the impact on visitors, as documented in public meeting transcripts and comments submitted throughout the planning processes, the negative impact 1) on both ORV and pedestrian users, and 2) on the quality of life for the local community has been substantial. Further evidence of the negative impact on the local community can be found in the general attitude toward park personnel and the numerous incidents of stress related illnesses that have been reported by individuals who have been actively involved in this issue.

RTI never mentions any of the above evidence. RTI does look at visitation but states that more aggressive resource protection policies have only been in effect since 2007 (3 years as of the writing of the cost benefit report) thus, RTI concludes that there is insufficient data to make a reliable estimate of average visitation.

This is not accurate. Instead, the data clearly shows that while visitation has been somewhat variable, each pullback has been followed by a new growth spurt. The most recent growth spurt (1997-2003) resulted in an average of 2.67 million visitors per year. Contrary to RTI, more aggressive resource protection policies began in 2004 or 7 years ago not 3 years ago. At this point, visitation dropped to 1993 levels. As restrictions have continued to increase, visitation has remained at or below 1993 levels. That is, this new level of visitation has persisted throughout the 7 years of aggressive management policies which is enough time to make an accurate estimate of annual visitation.

This new level of visitation represents a 17.4% decline from the most recent growth spurt and a 24% decline from the last peak in 2002. Based upon the fact that the local economy is almost "exclusively" dependent upon tourism resulting from park visitation, this substantial "long term" decline has drained local businesses' emergency reserves. As such businesses are increasingly questioning their long term viability. Other businesses have closed and foreclosures on rental properties are commonplace. Businesses made these point quite clear when surveyed but RTI seems to have ignored it.

So how has the NPS responded to the mounting complaints and the sharp decline in visitation? Just like RTI, the NPS attributes declines to other factors (i.e. the economy, gas prices, etc.). Actually the NPS goes further telling the residents they will get used to the "new normal" and that they will see new business opportunities for things like ecotourism and bird watching. 7 years later, the community is still waiting for the influx of ecotourism and bird watchers.

### Benefits

#### Piping Plover

Data for the Piping Plovers are summarized below. Management Strategy Fledge Rate (Chicks/Pair) 1992-2003 Management

0.63 2004 Management -- Superintendent's Order 07:ORV Management 0.00 Interim Plan Prototype & Interim Plan (2005-2007) 0.87 Consent Decree (2008-2011) 0.84

this is necessary look at the 2004 the fledge rate of 0.00. Does this fledge rate indicate that the 2004 Management policy was a failure? If you look at the weather conditions you will see that there was a T-storm with high winds on 6/10 followed by Hurricane Alex on 7/31. These two weather events likely resulted in the total loss of all chicks for 2004.

What about the 0.87 and 0.84 fledge rates for the 3 years under the Interim Plan and the 4 years under the Consent Decree? Are these results demonstrative of the success of the Interim Plan and the Consent Decree relative to the 1992-2003 Management Policy? Or are the Interim Plan and the Consent Decree fledge rates related to other factors--i.e. the lack of any storm activity?

The data suggest that the difference between fledge rates for the recent management policies and those reported for the 1992-2003 policies ARE weather related. Stated more specifically, if you remove the 4 years with storm activity from the 1992-2003 Management period, the recalculated fledge rate is 0.85 which is right in line with the 0.87 and 0.84 fledge rates for "good" weather years included in the Interim Plan and the Consent Decree, respectively. In fact, based upon this data, I submit that the different management policies have had NO impact on the productivity of Piping Plover.

#### Oystercatchers

Data for the Oystercatchers are summarized below

Management Strategy Fledge Rate (Chicks/Pair) 2000-2003 0.36 2004 Management -- Superintendent's Order 07:ORV Management 0.63 Interim Plan Prototype & Interim Plan (2005-2007) 0.43 Consent Decree (2008-2011) 1.00

For example, the fledge rate observed under the Consent Decree appears to be higher than that of previous policies. However, as the underlying data demonstrate, the Consent Decree fledge rate is being unduly influenced by the most recent two observations (2010 and 2011). With the limited data set it is impossible to say whether these fledge rates will repeat. Based upon the past trend, it seems likely the fledge rates will fall again then return to a slightly higher rate than in 2008--that is will continue the "long term" trend of modest improvement.

With respect to the population, the "long term" improvement in productivity has not translated into population growth. To the contrary, the Oystercatcher population at CHNSRA has continued to decline. Continued spending on productivity in the face of a declining population is a misallocation of resources.

#### Colonial Waterbirds

Due to the fact that CHNSRA management has changed the way it counts these colonies, it is impossible to make any statements regarding the benefits derived from new management techniques.

#### Sea Turtles

The main difference in management related to turtles is the Consent Decree ban on night driving. The rationale was that lights cause false crawls. The average false crawl ratio under the consent decree (2008 through 8/10/11) is 0.88. This figure is not statistically different from the average for the period of 2000-2008 of 1.0. Furthermore, the first recorded instance of a turtle take by a vehicle occurred during 2010 when the night driving ban was in effect. Is it possible that without the ban the driver would have had his lights on and would have seen the turtle? If this was intentional, would the presence of other night time users served as a deterrent? I submit that the answer to the latter is a resounding YES. This statement is based upon past experience. Furthermore, anglers that regularly frequent the beaches at dawn have helped notified park service resource personnel of nests missed by the morning patrols. Quite simply, the night time ban on ORV use has been counterproductive.

#### Summary

Despite the costs (i.e. the mass killing of wildlife thereby threatening the natural balance between predators and prey, adding nearly \$600,000 to the NPS resource management bill, and taking actions that have contributed to a 17.4% decline in visitation and stressed the local economy), new management policies have NOT resulted in improved productivity numbers for Piping Plovers nor have these actions halted the decline in the Oystercatcher and other non ESA listed populations at CHNSRA.

Despite this lack of success, the DOI/NPS plan to expand upon the previous unsuccessful efforts to boost shorebird productivity/populations and protect sea turtles. The estimated cost of the new resource protection efforts is nearly \$3 million dollars. This figure represents a 4-fold increase over 2004 resource management and a 2-fold increase over Interim Plan resource management and protection costs.

With respect to cost to the local economy, the NPS continues to write off the cost to the local community. RTI does make note of the significant impact on local businesses but then perpetuates past practice of defining the ROI so broadly as to negate the recognized impacts on the local economy. Finally, RTI ignores existing data and instead substitutes unreliable estimates of cost

and a model that does not take into account the unique characteristics of the local economy to estimate future costs. Actually, RTI recognizes the limitation of their data and models when they state that calculating quantitative estimates was not possible. Instead RTI chooses to provide "a qualitative ranking of the action alternatives relative to the no-action alternatives for the different categories of benefits and costs."

As I demonstrated above, we DO have reliable data as to the cost of the more aggressive policies that have been implement over the past 7 years--that is, a 17.4% decline in visitation, considerable dissatisfaction with opportunities to use park resources, and an erosion of the relationship between the park service and the local community. RTI and the NPS simply chose to ignore it.

With respect to what we can expect of the proposed rule and expanded protection efforts, comments from the DEIS/FEIS demonstrate that this trend in user dissatisfaction and tension between the community and the park service will continue to increase. In some cases businesses simply refuse to serve park personnel.

With respect to the costs to the economy, Cape Cod National Seashore can provide some insight. Cape Cod National Seashore is similar to Cape Hatteras National Seashore in that they derive a good deal of their tourist income from park visitation. In 1996, following the implementation of similar efforts at Cape Cod visitation fell by 10% and has remained at that lower level. Insofar as the villages of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands are surrounded by park service property and are considerably smaller in terms of land mass available for private enterprise, there are less non park related activities available and it is quite likely that the decrease in visitation will exceed the 10% observed at Cape Cod.

As for the impact on the local economy, Cape Cod's economic base did contract with many businesses that catered to park visitors closing entirely and others scaling way back. As RTI notes, however, communities with a larger economic base are better able to absorb impact for reduced visitation than smaller economies who depend more directly on park visitation. The latter is a description of the 8 villages of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands that have a total population of 4,000. What did RTI have to say about the potential costs to such small communities? That they will experience major economic impacts. That is, collect data from Cape Cod on business contractions and closings and expect that the economies of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands will experience much higher rates of business failures and loss of income due to reduced park visitation.

The most egregious nature of all this is that the NPS/DOI "ensured" that the local economy would be "exclusively" dependent upon park visitation when the NPS/DOI "insisted" on acquiring all the land surrounding the villages on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands and thereby limited the amount of land available for village expansion. The NPS has to know that this plan will substantially change the lives of the 4,000 residents of the villages on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands, causing many residents to leave the Islands and resulting in a much lower standard of living for those residents who remain. Yet the DOI asserts that "this document will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities under the RFA (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)." and the OMB has asserted that "This rule will not have an effect of \$100 million or more on the economy. It will not adversely affect in a material way the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or Tribal governments or communities."

With respect to the benchmark of \$100 million, you could shut down the entire rental industry on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands and not reach this figure. As such you must look to the relative impacts. In this regard, the population of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands totals a mere 4,000 and have an average per capita income of only \$40,000. Furthermore, as per RTI, "Almost all of the businesses in the Seashore villages are small." and rely directly on park service visitation. These business have already endured 7 years of losses associated with a 17.4% decline in park visitation. And, as I have demonstrated above stand to endure at least another 10% decline as a result of this new rule. Even RTI admits that there will be a significant impact on businesses that rely directly on park visitation in areas impacted by the new rule which includes every village on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. This being the case, the only way the DOI and the OMB can possible assert that the economic impact will not be material is if they have been mislead or if they have chosen to turn a blind eye to reality. APPENDIX E--Litigation History

The park service has made every attempt to avoid litigation. For example, in 2005 Bluewater, National Parks Conservation Association, Wilderness Society, and Natural Resources Defense Council requested ORV use be enjoined at all parks not in compliance with the 1972 & 1977 executive orders requiring an ORV regulation. In response, the park service agreed to include National Parks Conservation Association on the negotiated rulemaking committee in exchange for exclusion from the injunction. Many felt this decision was tantamount to bribery. As a result National Parks Conservation Association withdrew their application. Nonetheless, Bluewater, et al held up their part of the agreement.

SELC, DOW, and Audubon have not been as honorable. For example, subsequent to the USFWS issuing a No Jeopardy opinion on the Interim Plan, DOW and Audubon filed an letter of intent to sue. The park service responded by working with DOW and Audubon to come up with a series of acceptable performance measures. These measures were accepted and in July 2007 NPS issued a Finding of No Significant Impact and implemented the Interim Plan.

Despite the fact that SELC, DOW, and Audubon had actively participated in workshops held by Consensus Building Institute for the purpose of developing a long term plan and ORV Regulation, SELC filed suit on behalf of DOW and Audubon alleging the Interim Plan violated the ESA, NEPA, and failed to develop an ORV Regulation. Rather than argue the point and without admitting any violations of the ESA and NEPA, the park service agreed to terms of the Consent Decree.

Clearly SELC, et al has one goal--that is, to force the park service to meet their demands in total. Compromise or standing by one's word is not in their vocabulary.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12983    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12984    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12985    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12986    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I have been vacationing in the Outer Banks for over 35 years, and there is absolutely no need for driving on the shoreline. The Outer Bank islands are overdeveloped as they stand today, and allowing driving would put the environment at an even greater risk. We must protect the shore birds, wading birds, and other wildlife that use these beaches for nesting, foraging for food, and

raising their young.

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12987    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12988    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thanks for the opportunity to comment. Years ago maybe most of us didn't realize the damage to bird nesting and the destruction and decimation of the beaches by vehicles. This hurricane really did a number on Cape Hatteras and areas. Let's not continue the use of off the road vehicles. The storm was bad enough. We know more about bird nesting and birds than we ever did before. It is time to stop beach driving completely. Try walking. Work off the pounds and do the birds a favor. Let's save the birds.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12989    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** there is a nice feeling to be able to walk around and see natural in a automobile it is scared off and you miss so many of nature has to offer that soon may be gone without us,just remember when you where young the things you got to see your children and others may not.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12990    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow off-road vehicles to ruin the natural habitats of the abundant wildlife in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. There are parks that have been created especially for off-road vehicles, and I have seen how damaged the areas these parks occupy become. We need to protect our natural resources and parklands and those creatures that occupy them, not subject them and any families visiting this area to the noise, pollution and damage that these vehicles can cause.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12991    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles must be kept out of ecologically important areas. They are so destructive and damaging, even if ridden responsibly. Unfortunately many are not; dunes are destroyed, wildlife killed, plant life that is so important to stabilize shorelines dies and cannot grow back.

Make this destruction illegal.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12992    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12993    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12994    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12995    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off-road vehicles off our fragile beaches and shores. Noise, erosion, accidents to people and wild life easily result.

What a waste of fuel! Play that hurts others.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12996    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The current management plan at the Seashore has allowed sea turtles and beach-nesting birds to make a dramatic recovery, but the proposed regulation gives wildlife significantly less protection and allows ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12997    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off-road vehicles are disturbing the natural habitat of life along Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We are a part of nature and must live in harmony with the rest of the planet, not in opposition to it for our own entertainment or selfish purposes. Please oppose any legislation or other decision/action that will endanger their lives and those of their young.

Thank You, Amarili

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12998    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please restrict the use of Motor vehicles to designated routes, we have more than enough area to drive our vehicles without using up more valuable land.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 12999    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---



**Correspondence ID:** 13000    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Katie Sabella, DVM

**Correspondence ID:** 13001    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13002    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shore birds and other wildlife in Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shore birds and other wildlife in Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

**Correspondence ID:** 13003    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13004    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13005    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I support protection for birds, sea turtles, and other natural resources. I want management at national parks that safeguards wildlife from off-road driving and balances the needs of all user groups.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13006    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Please don't allow Recreational Vehicles along this fragile Seashore ecosystem. They are tearing up the environment and killing wildlife, especially vulnerable are the endangered Sea Turtles. Thank You, Gloria L. Hackedr

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13007    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles are killing our wild life. Please put a stop to that! Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13008    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** As someone who use to live near and has visited Cape Hatteras, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. As I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13009    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Off-road vehicles kill wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13010    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Frankly I was shocked to learn that the rangers at Cape Hatteras National Park were oblivious to the dangers that they were imposing on the bird population. Please reconsider allowing ATV's etc. in areas where the habitats of wild birds will be in

danger.

Thank you,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13011    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. While it is fun to drive on the beach and tourism benefits from this recreational activity, wildlife is also an important draw for tourism in the National Seashore and must be protected.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Leslie D. Edwards

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13012    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Below is a from letter urging you to protect nesting shorebirds and turtles from reckless ORV drivers. While I would prefer an all out ban on beach driving (there is no reason at all to drive on the beach unless a specific handicap prevents you from walking). I understand that a balance approach needs to occur. Please set aside enough area for nesting shorebirds and turtles populations to thrive while allowing those stupid ORV drivers their frivolous freedoms.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13013    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As a biologist, I oppose unrestricted off-road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife at Cape Hatteras National Seashore .

I am also opposed to the current proposal, as it only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And because it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, the numbers of this imperiled species could easily decline.

As such, I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13014    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13015    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Unregulated driving on the beaches at Cape Hatteras National Seashore has pushed the bird population there to the brink of extinction. Least Terns & Black Skimmer's population has plummeted 84% in 10 years. Sea turtles are declining. The NPS has proposed new permanent regulations for off-road vehicle use in this area. It would jeopardize much-needed wildlife protection for the birds & other wildlife. This proposal will control what happens at Cape Hatteras for decades & set a precedent for other national parks. Please strive for a balanced plan that would allow some responsible beach driving while mainly protecting our precious dwindling wildlife. We only have one chance. When wildlife is gone, it's gone forever.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13016    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE DISCONTINUE THE PERMISSION TO DRIVE ANY VEHICLES (AUTOS, TRUCKS, 4-WHEELERS, ETC) ON ANY OF THE BEACHES IN THE USA, ESPECIALLY AT THIS MOMENT CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE AS WELL AS THE OUTER BANKS, SINCE THERE HAS BEEN SO MUCH DAMAGE AND THESE AREAS ARE CRITICAL TO WILDLIFE AND THEIR BREEDING AND SURVIVAL. I HAVE BEEN OFFERED THE OPPORTUNITY TO DRIVE ON THE BEACH IN FLORIDA, AND I ALWAYS DECLINE BECAUSE I BELIEVE BEACHES SHOULD REMAIN AS PRISTINE AS POSSIBLE. I HAVE NEVER SEEN CAPE HATTERAS, BUT HOPE TO IN THE FUTURE AS PART OF MY "BUCKET LIST" AND HOPE TO FIND THE AREA BEAUTIFUL AND UNSPOILED. WE MUST PRESERVE "EVEN THE LEAST OF THESE". SINCERELY, JUDITH SLOANE

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13017    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** These are comments on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing off-road vehicle (ORV) use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, populations of sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have grown. I am very concerned, however, that the proposed regulation gives low importance to wildlife protection, provides few areas where vacationers can safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and enables ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach thereby impacting pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore without having to keep an eye on moving vehicles. The management plan should set aside additional areas for ORV-free uses.

The regulation should protect the species that depend on the Seashore by mandating specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nesting areas. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade much of the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13018    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13019    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13020    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13021    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Private vehicles should not be allowed on beaches. They should be reserved for pedestrians and wild life. Hasn't mankind spoiled enough pristine areas ? Let people who want to drive on beaches find some other kind of entertainment. Let us keep noise and pollution away from beaches. Preserving nature is more important than people's whim.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13022    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. The proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline. All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over.

Off road vehicle drivers are a small portion of those who visit Cape Hatteras National Seashore each year, but they are among the most vocal. Please keep that in mind when you make your considerations. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13023    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13024    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13025    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Please protect wildlife nesting areas. Let's keep our precious national resources natural and clear of the destruction and noise caused by off-road vehicles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13026    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** s to allow driving in areas where wildlife are nesting. We lose so much in exchange for a few minutes of reckless behavior. Please protect our wildlife. Please.

**Correspondence ID:** 13027    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I do NOT see the need for this change. People visit the beaches because they love nature. But they may not understand the impact of their presence on the beach. That is why there are rules, so we can co-exist. Regulations also provide education to our impact. If all these people love to be a part of nature it is reasonable that they should not be allowed to harm the ecosystem they are enjoying whether it be from ignorance or indifference. This area belongs to everyone. It is the responsibility of the government to be stuards of this areas and maintain a healthy ecosystem.

**Correspondence ID:** 13028    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. Because we have already lost so many species, we simply must do everything we can to protect those that remain. We owe that to future generations.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13029    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13030    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13031    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am shocked and outraged that this is even an issue! Allowing motor vehicles on the National Seashore, or ANY beach is simply anti-nature, but we ALL know (or should) that the outer banks of North Carolina are particularly fragile.

How can legislators proposing this kind of ruling say they have our best interests at heart?

How can I, as a citizen, believe they are not in some lobbyists back pocket?

When will our elected leaders do the right thing?

Motor vehicles on the beaches of our nation is NOT the right thing!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13032    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13033    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13034    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I live on the Pacific Coast, but the health of all of America's breeding bird populations is a matter of concern to me.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the NPS's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I



am very concerned that the proposed regulation does not make wildlife protection a top priority. In addition, families deserve to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches.

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13035	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	My wife, Kirsten, and I are concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulations about ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I have read that at present, with good management helping them, wildlife such as sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have increased nicely. Now I read that the off road lobby folks are pushing hard to use [despoil in our opinion] more of the beaches and parklands for ripping and roaring up, down and all over. This is very bad. Off roaders have plenty of land they have already torn up. Please hold the line. Do not allow more of the Park to be degraded for wildlife and the many quiet-loving humans. We ask that rules/regs to manage ORVs within the Seashore setup specific, enforceable areas and actions to protect wildlife and peacefulness.						
	The new rules/regs must protect wildlife that must have the sand to live/reproduce if it forces and enforces specific protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. In this nasty, noisy world, Americans and wildlife need more acreage of quiet. Keep those ORVs out of more park, please.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13036	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						
	The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.						

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13037	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						
	The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.						

I feel that these natural environments can be better appreciated with out the invasion of ORVs.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13038    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13039    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off-roading activities should be restricted to areas where birds and nesting areas are not found.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13040    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It is most important to save the last jewels of our nature worldwide. People have to accept this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13041    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Beaches should be vehicle free always and everywhere. Safety of wildlife and humans are at stake. There are just some places that should be quiet and not get eroded by the tire tracks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13042    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** To me, a park is a place for & of nature. I do not appreciate having vehicles mar & destroy what I would hope to be a personal time to reflect with nature. I appreciate even LESS the fact that vehicles destroy wildlife & their habitat. The people using those vehicles aren't there to enjoy nature at it's finest ~ let them take their vehicles to an asphalt & concrete "park" & have at it. Leave nature & it's creatures in peace the way it was meant to be & only way I want to enjoy it!! Thank you. Winona Bixby

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13043    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13044    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few

areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13045    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not let this proposal pass. Off road vehicles belong in designated off road areas not a beach with sensitive habitats. Does Cape Hatteras, the Nations first Seashore, a historical landmark, need off road vehicles on it's beaches? I have experienced this first hand on the West coast at Pismo Beach where vehicles are allowed on the beach... Not only will it destroy the natural native plants but will also disturb the local wildlife... This type of recreation attracts people with no respect to the wildlife and surroundings.. I can go on about what other activities it attracts but wont... Please dont let this pass...

thank you Krystof

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13046    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please consider and protect the wildlife, we are only to blame if they become extinct or the ecosystem is unbalanced.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13047    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13048    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the

Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13049      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13050      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It is imparitive that we support regulations that keep our environment safe for the species that live there. Off road vehicles are dangerous unto themselves but with no restrictions on flat beaches and dunes any living thing becomes threatened by the speed and reckless driving of these machines. Monitered roadways still allow for the low flying birds and insects to be smashed away by this intense desire to drive with speed, but unsupervised beach lands, dunes, wetlands and swamps put all kinds of wildlife in peril. Please consider passing and inforceing restrictions of these off road and all terrain vehicles on the last places of refuge wildlife calls "home". Ann L. Gearhart Education Director Snyder Foundation Baltimore MD

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13051      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I'm commenting on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened & endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors, including pre-European peoples, who encountered the wild coasts of North America.

ORV use impairs park resources, including diminished access & increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors & increased wildlife mortality& dwindling populations. But wildlife protections DO work. For several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds & turtles, their nests, chicks & hatchlings,& protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. Example: under the temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the plan's implementation.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers & other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so,& specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) & the natural and historic objects & the wild life therein & to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner & by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes & specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife

CHOOSE LIFE AND KEEP YOUR PROMISE!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13052      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** If I ride horses, I have to find equestrian trails. If I ski, I have to pay at a ski area. If I fish, I pay to enter the water with my boat. If I want to drive ORV's I should do it at an ORV park. There are many in California. The strong lobby for ORV's wants to by-pass that idea and fight for open riding in parks and other unsuitable areas. Why should ORV's have special privileges to damage terrain, destabilize wild life and annoy people who enjoy the natural amenities the park has to offer with their noise and fumes. I've seen ORV activity where the air is filled with dust visible for miles away from their riding. It creates a dust bowl. A

maintained area is the way to go. It costs more, but why should taxpayers clean up land they've ruined?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13053    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13054    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** My first visit to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore was as a child camping with my family. I remember getting sopping wet one night when a heavy rain inundated our little green tent. Nevertheless, I have returned many times as an adult, primarily to enjoy the shorebirds. I am now a professor in Environmental Studies, teaching Ornithology and Wildlife Ecology. As such, I am well-informed on the threats to nesting shorebirds by the use of off road vehicles. If we are to maintain this national seashore for future generations to enjoy, we must preserve the wildlife. Therefore, we must deny access to vehicles driving on the beach. We would never countenance off-road vehicles roaring around the trails in the GSMNP!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13055    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We must protect critical habitats, because any not preserved now aren't going to be there in the future to save.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13056    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Here on the West Coast of Florida I have had the opportunity to see the results of the great work of our local Audubon members who monitor and protect least tern and skimmer nests on our beaches and rooftops. They need protecting just from pedestrians on our beaches, and cars in the parking lots of the rooftop colonies. Thankfully there isn't any driving permitted on our beaches over here, and it horrifies me to think that these poor creatures have to suffer it elsewhere in this great nation of ours.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13057    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We need to save the seashore and the property for future wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13058    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13059    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13060    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am writing to express my serious concern about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen enormous benefits in the area. Sea turtles, piping plovers and other shorebirds are all rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife will likely be very negatively impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore. The Park Service, however, seems more concerned with promoting beach driving than it does protected the natural beauty of the seashore and it's wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use, and the rest is open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. This is totally inadequate. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians, particularly to protect nesting sites.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is totally unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13061    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear National Park System:

Re: Cape Hatteras National Seashore

PLEASE keep the ban on driving on the beach! Keeping wildlife protected is NOT an option. Beach-goers do not need to drive on the beach, but the wildlife requires the beach to live and reproduce and raise young. Additionally, having nearly been run over by drivers on beaches (the public, not park personnel), it is not safe for walking beach-goers to have others drive on the beach.

Thanks,

Melissa Blanchard

**Correspondence ID:** 13062    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13063    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13064    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Why can't we enjoy our wild places without making every square inch an amusement park? The character of the natural places is changed and damaged forever if we drive away all the wildlife that depend on them for their sustenance. there's nothing wrong with enjoying the wild responsibly. That means giving space to species for their young that is not invaded by people on a regular basis.

A scientific approach to monitoring and protection of wildlife is essential to any legislation affecting a wildlife habitat.

**Correspondence ID:** 13065    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please rescind unrestricted off-road vehicle use (ORV) in the Cape Hatteras area. It threatens shorebirds, sea turtles and other wildlife. Proper regulation of ORV is needed to protect nesting areas. Please help!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13066    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** please consider piping plovers and other shorebirds when making beach policy for all to enjoy! Thank you. Gayle

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13067    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to speak up on behalf of the wildlife at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We understand that the current management plan has allowed a comeback of sea turtles and beach-nesting birds. We applaud your good judgment in the conservation and protection of these animals that depend on the seashore for their survival. Alarmingly, we have heard that ORV use will be allowed to return to desecrate the beauty and tranquility of said seashore. The very name of National Park Service tells us that it's responsibility is to manage resources and serve not only the people of our nation, but to also include the beauty of nature. Is there some way you can keep ORV drivers in a designated area exclusively for their enjoyment? This would allow pedestrian and family rights to a stress free environment for recreation and allow the wildlife stress free living conditions. Surely, someone has the foresight to understand the importance of balance and being able to satisfy all users. Your attention to this pressing matter will be greatly appreciated by my family and the nation that you serve. Sincerely.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13068    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13069    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic



Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13070    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13071    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13072    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses. We must not only think of HUMAN needs. Please enforce strict regulations to save and protect our precious birds. Wildlife is not an option. It is an essential part of our well being. We must nurture and protect and ACT NOW in the interests of wildlife.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13073    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

Thank you for considering these comments and for the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving America's natural and cultural heritage.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13074    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Keep all vehicles off the seashore and protect what you are supposed to. They have no right to decimate pristine areas and harass and kill other species.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13075    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

These birds and other wildlife are virtually under attack by ORVs, and they need further protection, not a loss of true protection. WE are responsible to make sure that these birds and other wildlife do not suffer further loss of habitat. These regulations are all that stand between the destructive ORVs and the lives of these critters.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13076    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** This text comments on the National Park Service's proposed regulation that would managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The current management plan has helped sea turtles and beach-nesting birds repopulate. But the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

ORV management ought include specific, enforceable, science-based protections of wildlife and pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan ought set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will protect the species that depend on the Seashore only if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13077    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We are concerned about the NPS proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. So much of our eastern seaboard has been developed, so it is vitally important that we protect the remaining wild, undeveloped beach areas for wildlife security and for non-motorized users.

Wildlife deserve to be able to nest without their habitat being destroyed by careless motorized users. Americans deserve to be able to experience the beauty of these areas without the noise and pollution of ORVs, let alone the safety issue.

No-driving buffers around nesting sea turtles and birds like the piping plover are crucial if we are to preserve sensitive species. Migratory and wintering shorebirds protections are needed as well. As bird watchers and wildlife watchers we are very concerned about populations. Some species are rebounding because of temporary regulations meant to protect them. This is a good thing. The NPS must keep these protections in this plan. The Organic Act requires the NPS "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of future generations." The NPS must designate both ORV routes and specific and enforceable science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians. There must be vehicle-free areas. Right now there is no balance in the regulation. At least half of the beach should be available for non-motorized users.

Thanks for listening and for doing what is right for this national treasure.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13078    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13079    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13080    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a lay conservationist, wildlife enthusiast, and marine wildlife and ecosystem steward I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. My children's children should be able to appreciate it with the same quality of curiosity, for it's splendor, as I have thus far and to come, in my life.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13081	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am writing to express my concern regarding the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration, Beth Kramer

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13082	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.						

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13083	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape						

Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13084    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13085    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Will you be satisfied when everything is destroyed?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13086    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We need to protect this...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13087    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Be kind to animals.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13088    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

-Mita

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13089    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13090    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13091    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about this. The birds are under so much duress already - do they need more??? I am a career travel agent and send tourists to this area of the country. One of the joys people look for is the wild nature of outer banks which certainly includes the bird populations on the Sound and the Ocean. Please protect this habitat.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13092    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

As a nature and wildlife lover, especially of the seabirds and sea life at the beaches, PLEASE keep nature free from vehicles and protected. We in FL love our nature. Help us keep it. I value the peace and quiet of hiking and partaking of the natural beauty in the state and national parks of our states and country. Help preserve it!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13093    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Allowing off-road vehicles into wilderness areas destroys ecosystems and this affects ALL of us. We are not the only creatures on the planet. We have a responsibility to share this space with all creatures and plant life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13094    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect the wildlife of Cape Hatteras from the many dangers of off-road vehicles. In addition to running over wildlife, the added pollution is toxic to animals and people all around. ORV do not belong there. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13095    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13096    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Under the current management plan at the Cape Hatteras National, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have shown recovery. I want to visit this area to photograph birds. Thus, I am very concerned that the proposed regulation favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. The plan treats wildlife protection as optional and provides few areas for humans to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches. I advocate regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural state. The management plan should also set aside more areas for those uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13097    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please limit or illuminate off road vehicles on fragile shorelines where birds feed and rear their young.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13098    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** In regard to allowing recreational vehicles to ride on any part of Cape Hatteras beach or wetland or any property related to such, aren't we invading enough wildlife property as it is? Leave this as it is! There is also the fact that people go there to walk and enjoy the peqce and quiet that comes with visiting a WILDLIFE REFUGE! That's why they are called that. Don't let recreational vehicles use any part of it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13099    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The Park is to let wildlife live.....is the nature space without the human impact.....not for our recreation,but for their

conservation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13100    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

As coordinator of a volunteer bird steward program in Florida, I see first-hand how fragile the beach environment is for the natural wildlife. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback.

Even if you don't care about the wildlife, you must see that this is a big public safety issue as well! I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, favoring the rights of vehicles (heavy, motorized, fast machinery after all) to drive on large areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional and APPROPRIATE areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates these specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. We don't have much of it left in its natural state and that's what people come to see & enjoy & spend tourist dollars on, NOT MORE TRAFFIC!

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13101    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13102    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.



<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13103	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	)ff-road vehicle traffic should be tightly controlled throughout the nation. Destruction of wildlife and the natural terrain is detrimental of all citizens and should not be allowed to satisfy the pleasure of a few.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13104	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						
	The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.						
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13105	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Make the beaches safe for nesting birds and turtles!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13106	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						
	The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.						
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13107	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13108	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13109    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13110    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Wildlife needs protection. Please establish enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13111    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Alexandra Gawreliuk

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13112    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. As citizens of the United States and of the state of North Carolina, we demand that you consider the needs of the majority of beach goers who do NOT use ORVs and the needs of the threatened and endangered species who must have space to live and reproduce.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13113	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.						

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific,

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13114	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.						

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

Thank you for considering these comments and for the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13115    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I believe that the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore is inadequate to ensure protection of wildlife. More vehicle-free areas are required for both pedestrians and wildlife.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with the rest open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13116    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** They need your protection...could we put aside the money end of this and decide to get back to nature and avoid the noise. If they want the noise, go to the city. Let the majority of us enjoy the peace and quiet of nature.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13117    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The proposed regulations will control what happens at Cape Hatteras for decades and set a precedent for other national parks. A balanced plan would guarantee adequate space and protections for wildlife, while still allowing responsible beach driving in some areas so that all visitors can fully enjoy this national treasure. As written, the proposed regulation does not mandate specific, science-based protections for the wildlife that depends on the Seashore. In fact, it protects ONLY the rights of off-road vehicle users to drive on large areas of the beach to the exclusion of wildlife, it treats wildlife protection as optional, and it provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches. The National Park Service needs to know that people like you support management at your national parks that safeguards wildlife from off-road driving and balances the needs of all user groups.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13118    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It is important to save wild life, birds and turtoises nesting. Beaches are not really made for driving, are they?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13119    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13120    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray:

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jim Lansing

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13121    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13122    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13123    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Help our wildlife. Keep the ORV's off the beach. They are for the back roads.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13124    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13125    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Am sure you can come up with a solution to make it safe for the bird's and other animals who need the beach to nest, people do not need to have whole beach to ride their loud, noisy off road vehicle's. Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13126    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches. Finally, after years of advocacy and litigation by Defenders and our partners, the National Park Service is poised to adopt regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Yet the proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas. The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving. In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife. In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline. All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over. We have made great progress in winning important protections for Hatteras' wildlife, and we can't lose traction now. ORV advocates want the entire seashore open to beach driving. Tell the Park Service instead that you support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. We need to protect this area from all dangers to the nesting areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13127    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Protect the nesting areas for turtles, birds and other wildlife at Cape Hatteras!!! Not just the 26 miles of shoreline...

Leave a natural legacy for upcoming generations!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13128    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect sea turtles, seabirds and their nesting areas by limiting off-road vehicles on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The proposed management plan protects too little of the 67 miles of the Seashore from ORV use; please enlarge the amount of vehicle-free area. I urge you to enact specific, enforceable, science-based protections for this seaside wildlife. These animals are part of our national treasures and deserve undisturbed habitat. Thank you for your consideration.

**Correspondence ID:** 13129    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13130    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I feel strongly that the national park service must restrict and control the use of off-road vehicles and ATV's, etc. from the habitat areas of the parks and beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore areas (document ID NPS - 2011 - 0005 - 0001), please see to it, that this is done for the future of all species

.... Thank you, Wayne J. Leverton .....

**Correspondence ID:** 13131    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments!

**Correspondence ID:** 13132    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13133    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13134    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It seems to me that beaches should be for pedestrians and wildlife, not vehicles. However, if this is not to be there must be a solution to protect wildlife while still allowing ORVs reasonable access. I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. Enforcement is paramount because without this there is no one to protect wildlife. Please try to understand that it is important to us all that our wildlife be protected. Thank you for your concern in this matter

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13135    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13136    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007,



made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13137	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13138	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thanks for helping those defenseless creatures.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13139	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13140	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration. I have seen first hand the destruction and disregard for wildlife by drivers of ORVs on this seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13141    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback.

I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13142    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Janet Duran

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13143    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles,

their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13144    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13145    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13146    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I have seen drivers of ORVs destroy wildlife on these very beaches. There are enough designated areas where they can fish. It is time to protect the environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13147    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

As a frequent visitor to the Hatteras seashore, I support that it is a national treasure for everyone to responsibly enjoy. The wildlife is an important part of all we hold dear and it's so crucial that they have undisturbed areas where they can flourish and raise their young. I have personally witnessed the disturbances and damage that can be caused by "free wheelers" on these beautiful beaches and I encourage you to allow them limited space on which to wreak their havoc.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a

natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13148    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13149    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13150    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13151    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** To whom ever this letter via computer please help !!

I personally live animals esp. birds!! This rule to not protect the National wildlife is crazy!!

Please stop regulating nature!! We need all the animals on thos planet.. Please I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the oppertunityto comment this.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13152    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. I urge you to revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13153    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13154    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National

Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13155	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13156	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I would like to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Any proposed regulation that treats wildlife protection as optional, eliminates areas for families to enjoy vehicle-free (safe) beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife is gravely inappropriate at a national park. Regulations managing ORVs within the Seashore should include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in its natural state.						

Any regulation is only able to protect the species dependent on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add these buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13157	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and

pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13158    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13159    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** If we keep ignoring nature and the plethora of life other than human, we will eventually diminish our ability to be truly human. We will decimate the planet Please protect our wildlife. Phyllis Geller, LCSW, DCSW

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13160    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13161    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I have more than my share of these OHV/ATV offroad people destroying the great Mojave desert and the habitat of numerous plants and wildlife. These include the Joshua tree, the Desert Tortoise and the Pica. They trespass and destroy anything and everything that gets in their way! They should be banned and stopped now!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13162    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras

National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13163	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13164	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.						

Please extend and make permanent the current ORV use management plan at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore which allows wildlife and human visitors to benefit from vehicle-free beaches.

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13165	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the						



beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13166    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13167    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Not only are vehicles a potential danger to wildlife, ut they could easily harm humans on the beaches as well. It seems common sense to ban them from the beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13168    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13169    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the

beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for taking these facts into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13170    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13171    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** This is an important issue. Please do something about it.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13172    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Respectfully, I am requesting that you regulate and ban ATVs on beaches where there are endangered or threatened bird species, such as Cape Hatteras!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13173    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Carolyn McCreery

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13174    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please don't allow Off road (or on road vehicles for that matter!) on the beautiful shores of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It will not only harm the environment but it will more than likely destroy the natural beauty that brings tourists and nature lovers

to the Cape.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13175    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** At last I have an opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13176    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13177    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the

Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13178    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Allowing driving on the seashore is simply outrageous and unacceptable. Protection of wildlife should be the order of the day. California is absolutely more environmentally conscious.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13179    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I recently had the opportunity to spend some time in the Outer Banks area and I was in awe and have a renewed love and respect for the natural world especially this area. As an environmental educator, this visit re-energized me to continue my sharing this respect with the youth in my home town. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13180    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** There are enough places to ride that don't interfere with nature. These birds require this type of environment to SURVIVE. Recreational activities should be second to this

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13181    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** ORV's are noisy, smelly and destructive.

They have no place in public parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13182    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the

Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13183    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13184    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do everything possible to protect the endangered wildlife at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13185    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13186    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and

pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13187    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off-road vehicles do not belong on lands that have habitat for endangered species. National Park Service officials at Cape Hatteras National Seashore must obey the Organic Act which requires the federal government "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To comply with the law, the Park Service must prohibit all non-official use of ORVs on all lands in its jurisdiction. My family and I love to walk the beaches of our national seashores and lakeshores. This summer we spent a week at Assateague NS and a week at Indiana Dunes NL. We never used, nor had the need or desire to use, any motorized vehicle on any beach. My family and I walked to the beach from our campground and nearby parking lots. We got exercise and enjoyed the sounds of the waves splashing on the beaches. We wouldn't be able to enjoy those sounds with the droing of ORV engines. It would have ruined our experience. This country is suffering a terrible epidemic of obesity. People should be encouraged to walk for their health and for the health of the endangered species who make the beaches their homes. ORVs must be prohibited on 67 of the 67 miles of seashore beach at Cape Hatteras NS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13188    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned that the proposed regulation for managing ORV use in Cape Hatteras National Seashore treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13189    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13190    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am a resident of North Carolina, and am concerned about the dangers wildlife faces in the Cape Hatteras area.

My husband and I love this region for its unspoiled beauty, and for the opportunity it presents for sea turtles and birds to nest

there and increase their threatened populations.

Please do everything possible to protect our precious natural resources, especially the natural coastal beauty and protected wildlife! This is not a place for humans to encroach, as they do most everywhere else.

Thank you for hearing my comments.

Nancy Balog

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13191    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13192    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I hereby take the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing off-road-vehicle use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of off-road-vehicle users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

I support regulations to manage off-road vehicles within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will protect only the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as nondriving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that off-road vehicles will no longer dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for reading my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13193    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, the birds' nests and young could be disturbed.

I oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife.

Instead, I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and I support additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely, Jane Alexander

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13194    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13195    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed regulations for Cape Hatteras NS. Apparently, I need to remind you that the basic premise for management of the National Park System is to protect the natural resources. Human recreation is also to be encouraged, but not at the expense of the natural resource.

In my opinion, the current proposal elevates ORV usage to the extent that it seriously threatens the ecology of Cape Hatteras NS. I think the plan should be revised to give priority to protecting threatened wildlife species such as Least Terns, Black Skimmers, and sea turtles. ORV use should be restricted to areas where it will not harm sensitive wildlife.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13196    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. The Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under this plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers.

The Park Service must continue to designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13197    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please help us to conserve our beautiful birds. Do not approve legislation that is going to hurt these animals. All these traffic will disturb the animals that are nesting and raising little birds, have some compassion. Lets save our birds. Do not let the greed for money that will be derived from this traffic to hurt our most beautiful resources. thank you

mrs. Oneida Ramos

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13198    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00



**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13199    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13200    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13201    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape

Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13202    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13203    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13204    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am a field biologist and have spent considerable time in the field working on various bird projects. I am opposed to the the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Expanding ORV use across the Seashore would likely negatively impact threatened and endangered wildlife.

Protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area under the interim plan which is in place now. For example, sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. The proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. This plan needs to be revised to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

robin rauch

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13205    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13206    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

We travel to the beach every year, and it would be a real travesty if ORV users push out the very wildlife we like to see.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13207    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please help to preserve this important area. I've spent two summers near this area and was both encouraged by the number of people trying to protect and work with the sea turtles and frustrated by the larger number of people in their off road vehicles destroying the habitat. They seem to be intent only on their riding thrills for the day- never caring about the long range damage they are causing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13208    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13209    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow off-road vehicles to ruin our beautiful beaches and to harm our wildlife. Cars have no place on the beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13210    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13211	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Environment first not corporate profit first.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13212	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13213	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

As an ecologist, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13214	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles do not belong in our National Parks and other protected areas. The noise, pollution, and land destruction of these vehicles is not compatible with the preservation of land for all--including the non-human species that make these places their home. Please do not allow unlimited ORV access in Cape Hatteras or any National Park or protected area. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13215    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13216    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13217    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13218    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Hello-

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback.

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13219    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I FOR ONE KNOW YOU WILL DO THE RIGHT THING AND PROTECT THOSE BIRDS. I KNOW MANY PARK EMPLOYEES FROM OTHER PARKS AND THEY ALWAYS MAKE THE RIGHT DECISIONS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13220    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13221    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13222    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** # I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13223    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made

a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13224    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13225    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13226    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

Please insure measures of real protection for nesting birds, and reserve more areas for pedestrians enjoyment. These lands are sacred and it is our work to be stewards of the Earth and ecosystems on which we rely.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13227    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13228    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please prevent off road vehicles from killing the nesting birds in Cape Hatteras National Seashore

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13229    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a former park ranger and east coast beach-lover, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13230    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.

Finally, after years of advocacy and litigation by Defenders and our partners, the National Park Service is poised to adopt regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Yet the proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number



rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over.

We have made great progress in winning important protections for Hatteras' wildlife, and we can't lose traction now. ORV advocates want the entire seashore open to beach driving. I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13231    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13232    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13233    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13234    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13235    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13236    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13237    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** help nesting areas for all animals, enforce the rights of the animals. HELP THOSE WHO CANNOT HELP THERE  
SELF!!

PEOPLE ARE CRUEL!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13238    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13239    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13240    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Stop unrestricted off-road vehicle use. Our precious environment, including the flora and fauna, is far more important to future generations than the short-lived pleasure of the few who use these vehicles for recreation.

The regulations should protect the vast majority of Cape Hatteras for wildlife and allow unrestricted off-road vehicles on a very

small portion of this great site, the heritage of generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13241    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13242    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13243    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13244    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The reason people seek out places like Cape Hatteras is for the natural beauty and wild life that is offered no where else. Why don't you find a way to protect all that is natural to that environment from all that is unnatural, like the abuses inflicted by human activities, ie off road vehicles, polluting, dumping of garbage and over population (of both bodies and vehicles.) Once natural beauty and health of an ecosystem is gone, it is gone forever. Protect what needs protection.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13245    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13246    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The sea and it's shoreline need to be protected in order to sustain a balanced eco-system

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13247    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13248    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy quiet, vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage or eliminate ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses. We visit many national parks and national seashore areas during the year for vacation and peaceful recreation. ORVs are noisy and disturbing.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13249    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I have actively participated in all phases of the planning and rulemaking processes and have offered criticisms and suggestions with the hope of satisfying the concerns of protecting natural resources as required by Executive Orders 11644 and 11989 respecting ORV use, but without compromising the area's distinctive shore-oriented culture and economy. In prior comments, I continue to believe that the Final Environmental Impact Statement ("FEIS") and ORV Management Plan suffer from substantial problems, and that some of the fundamental aspects of those documents are without sound scientific basis and reflect a flawed

economic analysis. The comments and suggestions I have offered during each phase have been ignored. I cannot find responses to my comments for the FEIS. Proposed and planned regulations have become more restrictive of access at each step. I believe the effort to arrive at this point has been ineffective and the negotiating rule making process as I observed it was inherently flawed. I oppose this regulation in general because of the flawed process and disregard for the public input which has been offered. Nonetheless, in compliance with the rule making comment period instructions, I submit the following specific comments.

I have a number of concerns regarding the amendments proposed to 36 CFR part 7 which I believe must be addressed by the NPS in order to ensure that the final rule is in the best interest of the public.

Title: Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Cape Hatteras National Seashore, pg. 39350, Federal Register / Vol. 76, No. 129

The name of the area that is the subject of this regulation is legally and administratively ordered to be officially CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA (CHNSRA). Therefore I question the legality of the Federal Register publication as applied to this segment of Dare and Hyde Counties.

1. CHAPTER 1 SUBCHAPTER LXIII § 459 § 459. Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area; conditional establishment; acquisition of lands

When title to all the lands, except those within the limits of established villages, within boundaries to be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, 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

2. 459, Sec. 1, 54 Stat. 702. Words "national seashore recreational area" substituted in text for "national seashore" pursuant to act June 29, 1940.

3. Memorandum from Department of Interior Assistant Director Hillory A. Tolson, May 10, 1954, Short Title for Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Project.

It has been administratively determined that use may be made of the shorter title of "Cape Hatteras National Seashore" in all correspondence, except formal memoranda and documents which require the correct, full name of "Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area Project."

4. REMARKS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF INTERIOR ROGER ERNST AT THE DEDICATION OF CAPE HATTERAS NATIONAL SEASHORE RECREATIONAL AREA, APRIL 24, 1958 It is a privilege to represent the Department of the Interior at this dedication of the country's first national seashore recreational area.

Executive Order 11644 and 11989, (collectively, E.O.)

It is the purpose of this order to establish policies and provide for procedures that will ensure that the use of off-road vehicles on public lands will be controlled and directed so as to protect the resources of those lands, to promote the safety of all users of those lands, and to minimize conflicts among the various uses of those lands. Executive Order 11644, Sec. 1.

The promulgation of this ORV proposed plan will do little if anything to protect the resources of CHNSRA. The plan merely prohibits ORVs from the most preferred recreational areas. Nothing in the plan or Environmental Impact Statement will promote the recovery of the Federal or State listed species. There is merely an attempt to justify what has been done in the last few years and has failed. Turtles The CAHA Resource Reports show that in the last ten years nearly half of the sea turtle nests have not hatched due to storm overwash because they were left in situ too close to the ocean edge. The NPS has repeatedly been provided with analysis of their own data that shows this conclusively. The management refuses to perform the proper relocation of the turtle nests to safer areas as is done in all of the nesting areas along the Atlantic Ocean and Gulf shores. In addition, the lack of a comprehensive program to watch the nests at hatch time and make sure all hatchlings make it to the ocean causes extensive loss of hatchlings to ghost crabs and disorientation. By using several carefully selected sites for relocation, not only would more nests be saved but these few sites would make it easier to observe the nests during the hatch windows and assist the safe transit of the hatchlings to the ocean. The loggerheads are a threatened species that is being considered for endangered status. To assure the best possible success of the turtle species that nest on our beaches, a hatchery should be considered. The phenomenal success of releasing nearly 90% of the Kemps Ridley hatchlings to the Gulf from the Padre Island hatchery is proof of a low tech method of responding to the requirements of the Recovery Plan.

Birds Regardless of the requirements of the Consent Decree to enforce 1000 meter buffers in all directions of the Piping Plover nests, the productivity has not substantially improved. This year there have been fewer pairs, fewer surviving nests, and fewer fledglings. In spite of the killing of over 2,000 mammalian potential predators in the last few years, predation by raccoon, fox, opossum, mink, gulls, crows, ghost crabs and snakes are usually the reason given for the greatest losses that can be determined. In other years weather events of storm and tide have accounted for losses also. The last few years have been virtually storm free. There has been no documentation for loss by ORV.

Conflict of Users Following this proposed plan will greatly exacerbate the potential for conflict among users. By drastically cutting the amount of shoreline open for recreation, large numbers of visitors will be crowded into smaller areas. The forced location of swimmers, surfers, boogie boarders, fishermen (both casting lures and bottom fishing), kite boarders, wind sailors, etc makes for increased disagreements and infighting. One of the prime attractions of CHNSRA has been the availability of more remote areas and sections of like usage. The access to these areas with the necessary equipment is provided only by ORV travel. To even consider studying and developing a plan for the use of mass transit by tram and/or boat is beyond ridiculous and could only be imagined by someone with no knowledge of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area beaches and ocean shoreline!

E. O. Sec. (1), (2), (3) Page 39351 Federal Register / Vol. 76, No 129

The traditional and cultural practice of driving vehicles along the area nearest to the ocean has served to (1) "minimize damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, or other resources of the public lands." The beach in this area is easiest to drive on. Before the four wheel drive vehicle, cars, trucks and buses timed travel to coincide with low tide in order to more easily traverse the island. Vegetation is not present here and any tracks or disturbance is removed by the next high tide or at most the next full moon tide. (2) "minimize harassment of wildlife or significant disruption of wildlife habitats." Bird and turtle nesting occurs nearer the dune line. Drivers avoid the wrack line because of the possibility of harmful debris. Birds have been found NOT to be as disturbed by vehicles as by pedestrians. (3) The use of off road vehicles has been found not to have "conflicted with other existing recreational uses", in fact have enhanced them. These vehicles are needed to transport recreational equipment such as used for fishing, surf boarding, kite boarding, wind surfing, boogie boarding, various active sports equipment, sea shelling, kayaking, and supplies such as chairs, coolers and umbrellas. Many of the favorite walking beaches are only accessible by ORVs for most visitors. In fact, the ORV is the only way children, the elderly, the physically impaired can access the ocean shoreline.

The proposed setting aside of many miles of large and extensive areas where no vehicle can travel at any time of the year is not justified. There have been no substantive reasons presented to the public for such a plan. These are not areas shown to be at risk of (1) damage to soil, watershed, vegetation, or other resources. No studies have been provided that these are areas that (2) damage or disrupt wildlife habitats. There have been no statistics or information provided to show (3) conflict with other uses. Many of the proposed non-vehicle sections of CHNSRA can only be used and accessed by most people by vehicles. Most require long walks to access. They require construction of parking lots, boardwalks, and interdunal roads for other than four wheel drive cars. These facilities will not be available until funded. They are planned to be funded, at least in part, by off road vehicle permit fees of unknown amount. Such permit fees levied only on ORV users are discriminatory when being used not for ORV impacts, but for pedestrian convenience. The weak explanation of attracting more pedestrians to CHNSRA in order to boost the economy has no basis in fact. Already, those who rely on ORVs to access the beach have stopped coming to the islands. There have been ample written documentations of this fact in addition to oral comments and decreased visitation to the motels.

E. O., Sec. 3 (b) (Which does not appear in the Federal Register with the proposed rule)

"The respective agency head shall ensure adequate opportunity for public participation in the promulgation of such regulations and in the designation of areas and trails under this section..." Executive Order, Sec. 3(b). This absolutely and unequivocally has not been done. I have attended most of the public sessions. I have spoken and presented written material on various issues. My work has not been responded to properly. The Negotiated Rule Making Committee was a farce. Nothing submitted concerning access was acceptable. No scientific information, including results of CAHA Resource Reports was used. The groups that had sponsored and supported the Consent Decree were allowed to remain on the committee even though it was against the operating procedures of the committee. There was no consensus building. It was stipulated that the Consent Decree would not have any effect on the operations of the committee. The final conclusions and the DEIS, FEIS, and this ORV proposed rule were/are all based on the Consent Decree and the USGS Protocols which have not been peer reviewed and do not follow guidelines of the US government. There were no public meetings or other methods of education the public held by NPS to educate and inform the citizenry of the massive changes proposed for CHNSRA. This is a violation of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) as well as the E. O. The eight small villages with small family owned businesses have been heavily impacted by the Consent Decree and will be even more impacted by the ORV proposal if authorized. This impact has been deliberately obscured by the NPS economic analysis. This contracted document was not available for public comment before the FEIS was finalized.

Sec. 8. Monitoring of Effects and Review. (a) The respective agency head shall monitor the effects of the use of off-road vehicles on lands under their jurisdictions. On the basis of the information gathered, they shall from time to time amend or rescind designations of areas or other actions taken pursuant to this order as necessary to further the policy of this order

This proposal does not allow the superintendent to make changes as conditions change: that is, if the areas of ORV prohibition are not being utilized by humans on foot or listed plants or animals they may be opened to ORV use. By closing segments of beach along consecutive beaches the ORV is required to take extensive detours instead of continuing along the beach. In order to catch targeted fish, beach travel is often necessary depending on tide, contour of the beach, configuration of wave action, location of bird activity, wind direction, and other variables. This runs counter to the goal of every administration to reduce fuel usage and dependence on foreign oil. Such closures further annoy the public users when there is no apparent reason that can be justified scientifically, economically, or by pedestrian usages. None of these reasons or locations has been presented to the public for comment before being placed in the final EIS.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11989 (ADDED to above) Sec.9 Special Protection of the Public Lands. Added by Executive Order 11989 of May 24, 1977, 42 FR 26959, 3 CFR, 1977 Comp., p. 120 (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 3 of this Order, the respective agency head shall, whenever he determines that the use of off-road vehicles will cause or is causing

considerable adverse effects on the soil, vegetation, wildlife, wildlife habitat or cultural or historic resources of particular areas or trails of the public lands, immediately close such areas or trails to the type of off-road vehicle causing such effects, until such time as he determines that such adverse effects have been eliminated and that measures have been implemented to prevent future recurrence. (b) Each respective agency head is authorized to adopt the policy that portions of the public lands within his jurisdiction shall be closed to use by off-road vehicles except those areas or trails which are suitable and specifically designated as open to such use pursuant to Section 3 of this Order. It would therefore follow that the superintendent could open such areas previously closed if the situation changes. The Enabling Legislation (459) 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. To withhold any areas from public use of the greatest amount possible would violate the Congressional Law. When sections of the beach are closed off for wildlife or other reasons, the majority of the visitors who are then crowded into the small remaining sections are deprived of the benefit and enjoyment of the recreational area as stipulated in the Law. The Enabling Legislation (459a-2) also 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, the said area shall be permanently reserved as a primitive wilderness. Those areas that are adaptable for the uses specified, and like uses, are to be developed as the need dictates. The NPS visitor usage statistics and even the casual observer over the last 74 years can ascertain that there is increased need for more recreational area. Those uses would only be appropriate on the beach along the ocean and sound fronts. The uses are especially suited to Cape Point and the inlet spits. Any plan that eliminates or reduces the access to those areas by the majority of the users is in violation of the law of Congress. It would follow that if there is a requirement to set aside spaces for wildlife it should be accommodated in the wilderness areas. Examples of these accommodations would require the restoration and creation of areas for birds around ponds that are free of vegetation and removal of turtle nests to corrals or hatcheries instead of leaving them on the recreational beach area. It should be noted here that these methods would be more productive at less expense than what is currently being done or contemplated in the EIS or ORV plan. The threatened and endangered species that nest and rest on CHNSRA are few. The Piping Plover pairs have not exceeded 14 pair per year in 20 years. In 2011 there were only 10 fledglings in spite of all the protection given them and a season without significant storm events. The NPS has systematically removed predators during the last few years to a total of over 2,000 animals. Though turtle nesting is increased all along the Atlantic Coast, nearly 50% of the nests at CHNSRA are lost to ocean overwash each year regardless of the protection given them, including severe restrictions to beach users and prohibition of night driving. Surely it would be better to accomplish the requirements of the Recovery Plans by properly taking care of our wildlife than by simply developing rules to prohibit visitors in the necessary mode of access, the ORV, than merely prohibiting people from a national area that has been set aside for public use. Section 7.58(c) (2) ORV Permits. There has been no significant justification given for the need to require a permit for an ORV. The amount has been estimated to be in excess of \$200. This provision in the ORV plan is arbitrary and capricious and doesn't benefit the public. It will in fact discourage public use of CHNSRA which was the purpose for the creation of this national treasure. It is also discriminatory because other users of the beaches are not required to obtain a permit. 1. A properly managed recreational area requires little additional expense. The ramps that are in place have existed without substantial cost for many years. Improvements have been voluntarily partially funded by the North Carolina Beach Buggy Association and other groups. The planned additional ramps may never be approved or built. Previous interdunal roads have been closed by the NPS and allowed to become heavily vegetated and sand covered. Normal ORV use would have prevented this and can help maintain the roads in the future. Running a plow or other machinery along a trail is of much less expense than maintaining the current paved roads, creating proposed new roads and parking facilities or even maintaining the current bathroom facilities. 2. Additional parking areas and pedestrian walkways are not caused by ORV transportation. The cost of such facilities cannot be added into an ORV permit fee. 3. A required permit purchase will prohibit those impacted by the poor economy from using the beach in the manner they have been accustomed. Local unemployed/underemployed villagers will not be able to afford permits. The economic impact of beach closures has caused businesses to close and/or lay off staff. 4. The many local senior citizens will not be able to include a permit in their static budgets. 5. Expecting the permit system to fund resource management personnel is an unwarranted expense when there are more productive, lower cost methods of wildlife protection. 6. Administrative costs to run a permit system will be very low if modern technology such as the internet is used. If a permit system is considered necessary in order to educate visitors to CHNSRA, it should be at minimal cost of \$5-\$10. The permit should be available online as well as in person. In the computer world of today, people are accustomed to receiving educational information at the time and place of their choosing. In order to reduce impacts of obtaining permits on site, the permits should run annually from date of purchase, rather than calendar year. Historical experience at the CHNSRA and reported by the NPS confirms that visitor safety and resource protection have not been seriously threatened by ORVs without an educational program for their drivers. Nonetheless, I believe it is reasonable to implement a formal educational program for the future to ensure the protection of the resources at CHNSRA. All adult visitors to CHNSRA should have this knowledge. Many times pedestrians, including those on the village beaches, have been noted to have disturbed adult, fledgling, hatchling animals and nests. Most of the violations of beach closures, reported and unreported, have been committed by pedestrians who don't know or refuse to obey the rules. However, the program should be available through paper application, on-line application, and on-line, around-the-clock kiosks within the CHNSRA. Proven techniques are available to ensure that the quality of remote training processes attains the desired level of education for many subjects at a much lower cost and in a much more convenient manner than a traditional classroom setting. The NPS should avail itself of these techniques and not require by rule that such training occur "in person".

Section 7 Special use permits for off-road driving, temporary use.

(iii) ? The purpose of this paragraph is to provide an access option for mobility impaired individuals in pre-designated areas in front of villages during the time of year when ORV access is not otherwise permitted. This privilege should be extended to all vehicle free areas at any time of the year. This provision will be an important option for many visitors who would not otherwise be able to enjoy the more remote, most desirable portions of CHNSRA. There is no need for the vehicle to return to an allowed area. Both the driver and passenger may need such transport and there may be no other person available to drive the vehicle. The vehicle may be needed for medical supplies and shelter in the case of a bad weather event. Transport may be needed for a medical emergency. While the need for vehicle free areas on the beaches in front of the villages during the summer months is a long standing and necessary practice, there has been no need established for closing off large sections of the recreational area to the access by only those of superior strength and ability. This non-public reviewed closure designation prohibits families with young children, those with physical limitations, the older adults, as well as those with equipment that is required for their sport.



There are so few pedestrians, birds, or vehicles on the beach in the winter season that no closures are warranted. Such vehicle free areas are contrary to the purpose and language of the Enabling Legislation. The use of vehicles to access the beach has existed since vehicles were available on the islands. In the early years vehicles were used primarily for transportation. Pictures of the use of vehicles for recreational needs show them in established use from at least the 1940s. Such use is a cultural and historic use of this public land. It should be noted here that national parks are preserved to be viewed; national seashores are created to be used; a recreational area has a definite purpose that is stated in the Enabling Legislation.

#### Section 9 ORV Routes.

The designated routes on the tables within the ORV Routes section of the rule have major shortcomings that will significantly impair the visitor experience for the majority of visitors to the CHNSRA. Such severe limitation of the traditional and cultural use areas of CHNSRA will prohibit use by the visitor population to less beach space than the number of visitors require. The beaches most adaptable to use for swimming, fishing, surfing, kiteboarding, shelling, and scenic viewing have been closed to access to all but the most fit. The beaches most adaptable for sports that require extensive, large and heavy equipment have been removed from public access because such equipment can not be carried without the use of a vehicle. These areas, depending on season, tide, wind, and other factors specifically are: 1. Oregon Inlet Spit, south of ramp 4 to the Bait Pond (scenic viewing, fishing-drum, bluefish, and swimming); 2. the areas between Waves and Avon (fishing- drum, sea mullet); 3. south of ramp 38 (fishing ?drum, sea mullet, speckled trout, pompano); 4. south-east of the Buxton jetties to ramp 43 (fishing ?drum, sea mullet, pompano-, swimming); 5. Cape Point to Frisco Village (kiteboarding, surfing, shelling, scenic viewing, swimming, fishing ?drum, speckled trout, sea mullet, pompano, bluefish); 6. Hatteras village to inlet and sound (shelling, surfing, fishing ?speckled trout, spanish mackerel, bluefish, drum, flounder, crabbing, boogie boarding, scenic viewing); 7. North Ocracoke ramp 59 to the sound (shelling ?scotch bonnets, sand dollars, swimming, scenic viewing, fishing ?drum, bluefish) 8. ramp 70 to around the soundside (shelling ?sand dollars, scenic viewing, fishing ?drum, bluefish, flounder) Historically Recognized Routes have been excluded from the tables. Eleven historically recognized and utilized ORV routes have been excluded from the tables. These routes should continue to be available for public access via ORVs. Several of these areas have been excluded with the intention to provide visitors access to areas without the presence of vehicles. I believe this intention is misguided and that if ORV access is denied, the closed areas will not be used. The underutilized beaches of the Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge, areas north of Coquina Beach, and areas temporarily closed to ORV access for resource protection but not pedestrian access clearly demonstrate that most visitors seek beaches accessible by ORVs. CHAPA has previously submitted photographic logs and others have taken pictures which document the sparse use of several areas closed to ORV access. The areas closed to vehicles appear more likely to be additional bird sanctuaries. NO statistics have been presented to justify closing these massive areas to access by ORV. One can only surmise that this is another method of turning CHNSRA into a bird sanctuary contrary to the Enabling Legislation. If the NPS moves forward with its plan to close these areas that have historically been accessible to ORVs, it should revise the rule to provide for an adaptive management process pursuant to which the NPS could reopen these closures when the future visitor use patterns confirm the Coalition's position. These routes include: 1. Bodie Island ? ramp 1 to 0.5 mi south of Coquina Beach 2. Bodie Island ? eastern confluence of Atlantic Ocean and Oregon Inlet to the "bait pond" 3. Hatteras Island ? ramp 23 south to proposed new ramp 25.5 4. Hatteras Island ? ramp 27 south to ramp 30 5. Hatteras Island ? proposed new ramp 32.5 to ramp 34 6. Hatteras Island ? 0.3 mi west of Cape Point hook to proposed new ramp 47.5 7. Hatteras Island ? bone road beach exit around spit to Pamlico Sound 8. Ocracoke Island ? confluence of Pamlico Sound and Hatteras inlet to proposed new ramp 59.5 9. Ocracoke Island ? proposed new ramp 63 to 1 mi ne of proposed new ramp 67 10. Ocracoke Island ? ramp 68 to .4 mi ne of ramp 70 11. Ocracoke Island ? Inlet shoreline along South Point ORV access restrictions during the fall and spring seasons are excessive and punitive to the typical visitor during those periods. Historically, beaches fronting the villages within the CHNSRA have been opened to ORV access during the tourist "off-season", beginning September 15th and continuing until May 15th. Reduction of "off-season" access to the November 1st to March 31st period will effectively privatize these beaches for the fortunate few who can afford oceanfront homes and discriminate against those who cannot. Smaller crowds, fewer children, shorter days, less predictable weather, more wind, and migrating fish all affect visitor use patterns on the beaches in front of the villages. Should use patterns of these beaches change significantly in the future, recognition of longer tourist seasons and shorter "off-seasons" may be appropriate. Recent trends do not yet reflect this need. The seasonal dates should not be permanently established by rule, but determined annually by the Superintendent through consultation with Dare County, Hyde County and North Carolina Department of Transportation officials.

10 Superintendent Closures While "the Superintendent may temporarily limit, restrict, or terminate access to routes of areas", he/she should also be able to open these and open access to routes or areas previously closed to off-road use. It is necessary that a committee of local residents be formed to advise and inform the Superintendent and other managers of local known conditions and traditions. These NPS positions may change from time to time. Much harm has been done that has discouraged and actually destroyed local support and participation in the recreational area activities. There have been resignations from volunteers to the lighthouse and other programs. The hugely popular Take Me Fishing program was cancelled. Local shop keepers refuse to serve NPS personnel. There is an abundance of signs and vehicle stickers against the recreational stewards and stewardship. The CHNSRA is a dynamic environment. Erosion and accretion patterns on the beaches often change from year to year, season to season, and sometimes month to month. As a result of these changes, visitor use patterns change. Wildlife usage patterns change. The Superintendent should have the discretion to authorize enhanced access when he or she determines that such enhanced access is appropriate based upon consideration of the relevant factors. This fact has been recently noticed due to the force of Hurricane Irene. Storms, nor'easters, hurricanes, winds, and rain or lack thereof make many changes frequently. There can be no permanent plan enacted that will serve without continual adjustment. Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is not a static area. To believe it is and make rules accordingly is absolute ignorance. The dynamic nature of our beaches is the chief reason past wildlife practices have failed. Each year is different, each area is different, each animal is different. An examination of resource reports for the last 20 years would show this. We have submitted numerous charts and analyses done by recognized economists, accountants, scientists, and other professionals to the NPS to no avail. The wildlife suffers, the visitors suffer, the local residents suffer and the island economy suffers.

Section 11 Rules for Vehicle Operation (ii) Parts (B)(C)(D)(F) Demonstrate that those who wrote this document are unfamiliar with the characteristics of the Cape Hatteras beach and the ORV practices necessary there. B. An ORV driver needs to be aware

of the destination of the pedestrian and must move to accommodate that person whether he/she/they are attempting to move towards the dune or towards the ocean. C. It is frequently impossible to slow the vehicle to 5 miles/hour in a pedestrian or any other area. A beach vehicle requires greater speed than that to traverse the beach. Park Service vehicles do not do this. D. There has been no scientific information to determine that there is a need for this rule. Frequently groups of users will gather together to visit, eat, swim, participate in sports, or other beach activity. A one vehicle depth is only necessary when located at a narrow beach. This situation is self regulating. No rule is necessary. F. A 15 mph speed limit is unnecessary in open areas of the beach, especially in the off season or on remote beaches. One may wish to drive slowly to view the ocean or faster to get to where the birds show fishing possibilities. Traditional and cultural practices have evolved to take care of speed limits. Only those who are joy riding or testing the vehicle or driving recklessly and need attention by law enforcement officers break these common practices.

#### Section 12 Night Driving Restrictions.

Night time driving restrictions listed in the Proposed Rule should be eliminated. These restrictions have been proposed as protection measures for the threatened Loggerhead turtle. I have submitted numerous comments over the last six years regarding turtle protection at public hearings, the Negotiated Rule Making public comment periods, and during the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) comment period. My comments have not been properly responded to. I previously discussed this issue in the Turtles section of this submission.

Historical NPS records confirm that ORV access has not been responsible for material risk to nesting sea turtles within CHNSRA. In the most active years, nesting density within CHNSRA averages only two nests per mile of beach. Additionally, the average number of turtles nesting nightly along the entire seashore in ORV areas and non-ORV areas during the prime months of June and July is only four, including false crawls. The odds of a turtle encounter with visitors leaving the beach after dark, or arriving on the beach at sunrise, are extremely low and do not justify night time closures to ORVs. Sandy Macpherson of USFWS stated at a Negotiated Rule Making presentation that moving lights do not disturb turtles. Stationary lights might.

It is important to note that the NPS has the latitude to use resource management processes at CHNSRA (unrelated to ORV access) that, in one year, can save more hatchlings than have died due to ORV or pedestrian events during the entire history of CHNSRA. Historical records show that natural events including predation and ocean over wash pose significant threats to the success of turtle nests at CHNSRA. Over the past couple of years, the NPS appears to have given more consideration (although still inadequate) to nest relocations for at-risk nests and has better managed hatch corridors during hatch windows. The NPS should more strongly pursue best practices for turtle resource management that have been successful at other locations.

#### Section 13 Vehicle Carrying Capacity

Limiting the number of vehicles on any portion of the beach is unnecessary and doesn't work in the tradition and culture of CHNSRA. In some areas due to tide, closures, fishing activity, beach structure, family and group gatherings there may be a temporary need for a more dense arrangement of vehicles. Any crowding is self-limiting. Visitors choose the less populated areas and avoid the crowds. This is a treasured benefit of the recreational area. The freedom to select a beach of individual choice is a freedom that is cherished.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area does not need more rules. These islands are National Treasures that require better management by knowledgeable National Park Service employees.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13250	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	A National Seashore is no place for recreational vehicles! It is a place to protect wildlife and enjoy unspoiled nature. These vehicles destroy both.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13251	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America. It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan. However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein						

and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes. Robert

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13252    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** ORVs have no place on a beach whether it is people trying to enjoy it or birds nesting and trying to raise their young. Thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13253    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13254    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I enjoy quietness in nature, not noisy gasoline engines especially when i am at the shore. Give me and the wildlife a break.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13255    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please add specific protections for wildlife to the regulation. I believe the entire Seashore should be closed to vehicles. But if vehicles continue to be permitted, specific, mandatory science-based wildlife protections should be included in the regulation, including no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nest, chicks and hatchlings, as well as protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13256    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes an

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13257    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13258    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Unrestricted off road vehicle use is destructive to many birds, turtles, etc on Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore. Why are people allowed to ride there? We must preserve our wild treasures, not destroy them.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13259    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, Please accept these comments regarding the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORVs at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I vacation in Hatteras and love the unspoiled beaches. I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. The regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. This is inadequate to protect wildlife and people walking on the beach. If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians. For example, non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Cynthia Patterson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13260    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please allow the birds of Cape Hatteras to survive on the National Seashore .. The Plover Bird and its chicks rely on the seashore for its many sustaining properties. The birds nest on the shoreline and are able to feed their young by themselves being fed from the wealth of seashore life that reaches these waters. If vehicles are allowed to be driven along this seashore then the destruction of its natural wildlife and species of birds is at stake. Also the vehicles pollute the shoreline and contribute to the erosion of the shoreline. Please do vote that the vehicles not be allowed to be driven along the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Sincerely yours Phyllis Francene Livera

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13261    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed. Please prevent off road vehicles from despoiling our national seashores.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13262    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13263    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13264    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13265    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made

a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Lisa McGonigle

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13266	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13267	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please protect the birds and wildlife, it is so important						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13268	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We support full protection for wildlife, which means imposing further limits on ORV use. The proposed regulation change does not go far enough to protect our wildlife, particularly sea turtles, from the extreme damage caused by ORVs.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13269	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Don't allow off-road vehicles to kill the wildlife in Cape Hatteras National Seashore. PLEASE put this beautiful place ahead of allowing morons who have no regard for life and beauty to destroy it with these completely unnecessary vehicles.						

It's time someone somewhere says "NO!" to mindless development and mindless use of dangerous vehicles.

PLEASE DO THE RIGHT THING...THE MORAL THING.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13270	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** we cannot keep abusing the land and the creatures that need protection or we will have nothing left.

**Correspondence ID:** 13271    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13272    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration. Donna Watson

**Correspondence ID:** 13273    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I greatly appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am deeply concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I strongly support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state! The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses!

The regulation will protect the species that depend on the Seashore only if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please, add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13274    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles should be banned from the shorelines to protect animals doing their natural way of lives. There are other areas these people can have fun. Leave wildlife alone!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13275    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please regulate vehicle activity to protect wildlife, especially nesting shore birds, in their habitat. Ther must be safer, sensible places to drive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13276    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose letting ORVs destroy habitat on our national seashores. I urge you to severely restrict ORV access to Cape Hatteras National Seashore to protect and preserve wildlife. In my opinion, ORVs do not belong on our national seashores ever! They are too destructive to habitat and wildlife, and they also destroy the pleasure of people wanting to enjoy more quiet forms of recreation. Keep ORVs off the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13277    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13278    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13279    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not



continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13280    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13281    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I would like to see the park system protect the vulnerable wildlife populations from unnecessary exposure to ORV's. It is especially important to shield nesting grounds, but the entire beach is precious "homeland" to many populations of wildlife, some of which are dangerously eroding in size due to many factors. But one factor that can be prevented is being run over by a vehicle driving on the beach.

I hope that you will make efforts to write regulations that are based on the studies of scientists who are experts on what the wildlife needs to sustain viable life on and near the beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13282    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13283    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I do not favor allowing all terrain vehicles or other such vehicles on beaches, trails or any other location that is meant to be for people walking with the possible exception of bicycles.

When the use of such vehicles threaten the life cycles of rare birds and animals there is all the more reason to disallow them. There are all too few places for people to go when the world of chaos is not intruding. Our national parks and public beaches should be preserved for those kinds of experiences.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13284    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.

I oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife.

The National Park Service is poised to adopt regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore, but the proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving. In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas

has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline. All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over. Great progress has been made in winning important protections for Hatteras' wildlife, and we can't lose traction now. Narcissistic ORV advocates want the entire seashore open to beach driving. I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles t

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13285    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** add specific protections for wildlife and pedestrian visitors into the ORV regulation to ensure wildlife recovery continues and that the safety of all visitors is protected.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13286    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13287    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13288    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** one of the reasons for the national park system is to protect special areas that are disappearing or are in danger of disappearing. it seems that the cape hatteras national seashore should have special protection for the wildlife to live undisturbed by recreational vehicles( sometimes perhaps even foot traffic) which can disrupt breeding and destroy nesting areas and nests. while recreation is also important, we need to make sure that we leave breeding grounds for the plants and animals who have lost the greatest proportion of where they are able to live and breed. thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13289    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13290	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe we need to keep the breeding grounds of the Least Tern, and other beach-nesting birds, protected. Allowing off-road vehicles will not only endanger these birds, but it will cause erosion, and other environmental hazards, to the Cape Hatteras area.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13291	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13292	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13293	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am deeply opposed to unrestricted vehicle use that threatens wildlife. There is no reason why people should be able to drive as fast as they want as recklessly as they want, particularly when this behavior threatens life. I am urging you to restrict vehicle operation where it threatens wildlife.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13294	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

**Correspondence:** I don't feel this goes far enough to protect the natural birds and wildlife in the Cape Hatteras area. There is no need for motorized vehicles anymore on ANY beaches. Those days are gone, along with 5 cent candy bars! With ever increasing populations and tons of cars on the roads, we do not need ANY on the beaches!

The animals who live there and people who want to enjoy the beach, should do so on their feet! Leave the motorized vehicles in the parking lots! It will preserve the beach and let animals and plants grow and flourish. Thank you, for doing all you can do to protect our shores.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13295    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13296    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

At this time as I do every day, I am sitting and looking out of my window and watching the migrating Orioles and Hummingbirds enjoy my feeder. It gives me so much pleasure to see Nature at its best.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13297    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13298    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Respect for nature and its inhabitants should be the only goal of all the land designated for this purpose. Please consider

specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

Consider where you live...would you be happy if there were others who violated your privacy and safety? Wouldn't you want protection of basic rights? Why not natures gifts.....

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13299    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13300    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13301    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

As a shorebird/seabird manager for Florida, I am extremely concerned about the proposed regulation, especially when you consider that there are very few places left in the entire Southeast where these species can nest naturally with little disturbance. Most of these species have experienced dramatic declines in Florida, and ORV use is particularly threatening to two of our most important sites on the Atlantic Coast. The precedent you set with the new proposal could have disastrous consequences for our sites in Florida.

I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13302    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes a

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13303    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The animals and plants deserve protection. If we can protect them anywhere it is on federal park land. Do what is right.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13304    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13305    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13306    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by many, and its natural wild life needs to be preserved.

Off Road Vehicles or Off Road Bikes will only destroy our national treasure and the wild life it contains. We have no right to destroy what is part of our environment for the pleasure of a few people who have no regards for nature.

Thank you,

Victoria Francis

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13307    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. As a member of the Audubon society I am watching this issue with great interest and concern.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13308    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE BE AWARE AND CONSIDER PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES WITH THESE PLANS. BY NOT ALLOWING VEHICLE ACCESS TO CERTAIN AREAS- PEOPLE WHO ARE NOT ABLE TO WALK WILL BE EXCLUDED FROM THE JOY AND ABILITY TO UTILIZE THESE AREAS. NOT ONLY THOSE WHO CANT WALK BUT THOSE WHO HAVE CARDIAC AND PULMONARY AND CANCER ISSUES WHO MAY NOT BE ABLE TO WALK LONG DISTANCES OR WALK IN THE HEAT OF SUMMER. THE VEHICLE ACCESS ALLOWED THESE FOLKS THE FREEDOM TO ENJOY AREAS THEY WOULD NEVER HAD BEEN ABLE TO ENJOY ANYWHERE ELSE IN THIS COUNTRY- THAT THEY WERE ALWAYS ALLOWED TO ENJOY UP TO THIS POINT. IT WOULD BE A PITY FOR SUCH A RESOURCE THAT WAS SO HANDICAP FRIENDLY BY VEHICLE TO BE RESTRICTED FOR THAT GROUP. THE ELDERLY WOULD ALSO BE EXCLUDED FROM MUCH OF THE AREA IF NO VEHICLE ACCESS WAS ALLOWED- THE VERY PEOPLE WHO DONATED THE LAND AND PAID THE TAXES TO BUILD THIS COUNTRY. COMMENT ON ACCESS- HAVE AN ONLINE MODULE WITH INFORMATION AND TEST THAT CAN BE TAKEN AND CERTIFIED THAT YOU RECEIVED THE NECESSARY INFORMATION TO UTILIZE THE AREA. MAKE IT AVAILABLE ANYTIME SO THERE IS NO VISITOR BACK -LOG ON WEEKENDS /HOLIDAYS. THIS COULD ALSO BE INCLUDED WITH AN ON LINE SITE TO BUY PERMIT ONLINE, MUCH LIKE WE CAN DO WITH FISHING LICENSE. PLEASE DON'T RESTRICT THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE WHO CAN USE THE BEACH- WE HAVE BEEN COMING FOR 30 + YRS AND EVERYONE HAS BEEN ABLE TO UTILIZE AREA EVEN ON HOLIDAYS WITHOUT RESTRICTIONS OR PROBLEMS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13309    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13310    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13311    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please make provisions to restrict or eliminate ORV traffic on these beautiful beaches. It's not worth losing precious wildlife. Thank you very much.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13312    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13313    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** DO NOT ALLOW THIS TYPE OF ACCESS -- IT WILL BE HARMFUL TO ALL LIVING THINGS!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13314    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13315    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13316    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov



**Correspondence:** The Park Service must support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting and restrict ATV's from all sensitive areas, throughout the year!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13317    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** do not allow these vehicles on NC beaches!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13318    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect the birds and other wildlife in these areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13319    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13320    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13321    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** There is no need to allow any motorized vehicles other than ranger patrols or emergency vehicles on any National Seashore. We are not preserving the seashores for idiotic recreation, we are protecting these environments FROM us. The birds, turtles and other wildlife have MORE right to be left alone. If anyone wants to ride a dune buggy on sand, let someone build a theme park away from the shore and charge admission for use. We were the LAST species to evolve on earth. We MUST stop acting as though everything we see on the planet is ours to use, abuse and destroy.

We can have a positive effect on our surroundings when we do the right thing.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

Banning vehicles from the National Seashores could be a HUGE step in the right direction.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13322    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Do not loosen beach access rules and regulations to allow most off road, atv or dune buggy activity.

**Correspondence ID:** 13323      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

**Correspondence ID:** 13324      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13325      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic

Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13326    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I oppose unrestricted off-road vehicle use, because it threatens sea turtles, shore birds, and other wildlife, including all your listed endangered species.

Silly you.

Why would you pass this rule? The original 'prohibited unless by special regulation' rule works fine. Listen. You wrote that Cape Hatteras is the nation's first national seashore, that it's part of a dynamic barrier island system. Why negatively mark that beauty and intrude on the natural setting with the loud, annoying dune buggies, etc (I don't know what those open-top cars that run over sand well with the high wheels are really called :D) when we should strive for the pristine?

Yep. Thanks for your time! And have a great day. It's frickin' over 80 degrees Fahrenheit, 76% humidity here in Wisconsin (what!) and it's 10pm. Hopefully your day is warm, dry, and breezy :)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13327    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

Off-road vehicle use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore needs stronger and different regulations. Most of the seashore under the Park Service plan is dedicated to vehicles rather than pedestrians and wildlife.

The wildlife is only going to be protected with your help. Please do not put beach driving as a stronger priority than the wildlife, especially the sea turtles. They do not have the choice to move to another location, and they certainly do not have the ability to outrun or outmaneuver vehicles.

I have traveled to this Seashore, walked along the beaches. The only people who enjoy the beach drivers are the ones driving; the pedestrians don't, and the wildlife suffers. Please reset your priorities and protect most of the beaches for non-vehicle use.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13328    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** There are many many folks whose actions reflect a lack of conscience concerning other creatures on the planet. When one person's recreation endangers and kills another being's life, we need to step in to help those unable to speak for themselves. We need to fine those who just don't care, and use those moneys to heighten awareness as well as support the efforts of the National Park System.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13329    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** ORV use should not be unrestricted. It is imperative that ORV access be restricted in Cape Hatteras National Seashore to protect wildlife. This is a National treasure for all to enjoy. Many enjoy the wildlife. This enjoyment will be threatened and/or eliminated if unrestricted ORV use is approved. The right/enjoyment of those with ORV's should not pre-empt other means of enjoyment of this treasure. Willdlife must be protected from ORV use in order to survive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13330    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a

natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13331    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

Therefore, I encourage you to instead base all decisions on specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife, and provide additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13332    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles kill wildlife and destroy nesting areas. I support specific enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. Future generations will thank us.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13333    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We have enough motorized vehicles on our roads and do not need them on our beaches. They do nothing but destroy plants, animals, and the ecosystem. What is the point in walking and trying to enjoy nature with ORVs driving by.

I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

We do not need ORVs on our beaches. It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

Wildlife is already threatened by habitat destruction and global warming and we have an obligation to protect this area for the enjoyment of future generations."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13334    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about the future of Cape Hatteras National Seashore, and I am writing to urge you to preserve its natural beauty and importance to wildlife and humans alike. Cape Hatteras is increasingly threatened by indiscriminate off-road vehicle (ORV) use, especially along beaches where they disrupt the life cycles of birds, turtles and other wildlife and cause populations of protected species to plummet. It is imperative that the NPS develop strong and enforceable permanent regulations to contain and channel ORV use. Under the Park Service's temporary regulations for ORV management, many species have made a comeback; such regulations demonstrate that it's not too late for thoughtful, science-based policies to undo the tremendous damage we have done to the natural world with other creatures. I was dismayed to learn that proposed permanent regulations in their present draft form lack the critically important wildlife protections contained in the temporary version that have recently helped species like the piping plover and loggerhead sea turtle to survive and thrive. The Park Service has an obligation under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To fulfill this obligation, the Park Service needs to designate specific ORV routes, create larger vehicle-free areas, and include clear, enforceable and science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the new permanent

regulations.

Thank you for considering my comments, and also for your role in protecting one of the Atlantic's last wild seashores!

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13335	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Off vehicles should not be in the national parks where species are threatened.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13336	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						
	The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13337	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This past weekend, many national parks and communities along our East Coast sustained damage from Hurricane Irene. North Carolina's Cape Hatteras National Seashore was no exception. We hope the families who live in and around the Outer Banks are safe and that recovery efforts can happen quickly. But while the park and its neighbors work to recover from the storm's immediate impact, we can make a difference in the long-term protection of Cape Hatteras!						
	As one of the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach habitat on the Atlantic coast, Cape Hatteras is a national treasure visited by millions of Americans. It is also home to nesting shore birds and sea turtles who are threatened by off-road vehicle (ORV) use along beaches. During these critical seasons, it is important to curb off-road vehicles to allow these species the space to grow and fledge.						
	Plummeting populations of protected wildlife species at Cape Hatteras are starting to recover thanks to increased management protections from the National Park Service (NPS). However, these protections are temporary while NPS prepares a final ORV management regulation. The regulation is nearly completed, but the current draft lacks the critical wildlife protections that have helped species like the piping plover and loggerhead sea turtle.						
	I ask NPS to add specific protections for wildlife and pedestrian visitors into the ORV regulation to ensure wildlife recovery continues and that the safety of all visitors is protected.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13338	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please save and defend the seashore creatures who have lived on Cape Hatteras shores long before we were born. Put a stop to vehicles having so much use of the shoreline. This means killing and injuring poor little shorebirds and seaturtles, as well as other sea creatures and beautiful growth. The sea and sand creatures are living species who have a right to survive in a large extended area. Drivers will kill and injure so many. Our wildlife areas are places of beauty and sanctity and should be protected. Keep vehicles off these shores so they may extend and grow, not be destroyed. These are sacred areas, not for wild driving and careless entertainment. Thank you for thinking hard about this upsetting matter. Think with a heart. Thank you in advance for your whole attention in this matter. Ann Agasi in CT.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13339	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include						

specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13340    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Stop killing shoreline wildlife!!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13341    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13342    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Julie Roberts

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13343    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13344    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13345    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13346    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As an elementary school teacher of 4th graders, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007,

made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. My students are counting on people like you to protect and preserve the wildlife that they love and want to survive for the next generations of their children and so on...

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13347	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13348	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please approve the legislation to ban use of offroad vehicles along the Cape Hatteras shoreline. I'm not against offroad vehicle recreation but it must be used in a responsible manner. Wildlife should not perish as a result of our enjoyment or recreational pleasure, even if it is unintentional. Please ban offroad vehicle use in this region which teems with wildlife.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13349	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13350	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include						



specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13351    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulations for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I am very much against loosening the protection of wildlife and citizens seeking a quite seashore. Although I would prefer to see and outright ban on the wasteful and destructive machines, I know the lobby for them is too strong, but they should be restricted to areas and times where they have minimum impact on wildlife and citizens. I know from experience in the west where I lived with National forest on 3 sides of me that ORV users can be very destructive and many do not follow rules and signs. We need endorsable, science-based protections. ORVs must be regulated and it must be enforced or wildlife will disappear, and the Seashore will degrade to a noisy playground. Thank you for this opportunity.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13352    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Give more room for wildlife. Humans are overrunning the other species. Do your part to assist the other species.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13353    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13354    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13355    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras

National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

I am planning a trip to the area in March 2012 and am looking forward to seeing undisturbed natural seashore and wildlife, not ORVs.

Thank you, Wendy Hinson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13356    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13357    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The Cape Hatteras National Seashore should be protected from off road vehicle use. These lands should be kept for wildlife, not for beach drivers. The records already show that with temporary protections in place, sea turtles are returning in greater numbers. I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife, and NO off road vehicle use within Cape Hatteras National Seashore lands.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13358    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off the road vehicles should not be permitted to roam throughout Cape Hatteras National Seashore . There is no doubt that these vehicles would disturb wildlife, if not physically harm them and disrupt nesting.

Off road vehicles in the area would degrade the experience of visitors to the National Seashore as well.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13359    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,01,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National

Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13360	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I believe that animals should be protected in their own habitat from ATVs and other vehicles.						

Katharine Rosser

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13361	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,01,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13362	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993
<b>Name:</b>	Luizer, Virginia L				
<b>Received:</b>	Aug,21,2011 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	APPENDIX D--Cost/Benefit Analysis The DEIS was published on March 12, 2010. The FEIS was published on November 11, 2010. The record of decision to adopt the FEIS was published on December 20, 2010. The cost benefit analysis on which the DEIS, FEIS, and the record of decision were based was published on July 6, 2011. This timing of the above events denied the public any opportunity to comment on the cost benefit analysis. Even more disturbing is the fact that the DEIS and the FEIS were written without having a completed cost benefit analysis in hand. I submit that the DEIS and the FEIS conclusions were written in advance and the cost benefit analysis was written to support the conclusions presented in the DEIS and FEIS. Finally, as I will demonstrate below the cost benefit analysis effectively ignores the impact on the residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands, the economies of which are dependent upon visitation to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. Based on these facts, I call upon the park service to rescind the record of decision, to redo the socio economic analysis using data available as opposed to using questionable data and erroneous models, and to resubmit the FEIS for public comment. RTI INTERNATIONAL COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS There are three flaws in the RTI International cost benefit analysis. The first is the definition of the ROI. In the Interim Plan, the park service defined the ROI as Outer Banks Dare and Hyde Counties. Comments demonstrated that this broad definition of the ROI served to minimize the impact on the 4,000 residents of the 8 villages of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands with economies that are dependent upon park visitation. RTI International used the				

same flawed definition of the ROI as was used by the park service in the Interim Plan. As evidenced by the statements presented below, using a wider ROI guaranteed the same result as achieved in the Interim Plan—that is, major negative impacts to the residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands would be summarily dismissed. "The impacts will have the largest impact on businesses in the Seashore villages. Visitors to other parts of the Dare County generally use the beaches in the northern part of the Outer Banks, which are outside the Seashore. Almost all of the businesses in the Seashore villages are small. Small businesses have a harder time absorbing revenue losses and there may be individual businesses that experience major impacts.1 The business impacts will fall most heavily on the Seashore villages and on small businesses. Some businesses north of the Seashore will be impacted by changes in ORV use; however, the impact on the villages north of the Seashore will be cushioned by the larger economic base of visitors who come primarily to use the beaches north of the Seashore. The Seashore villages depend most directly on visitors to the Seashore. Even if the overall impacts on Dare and Hyde counties or on the Seashore villages as a whole turn out to be smaller than anticipated, some individual businesses that depend on visitors to a particular beach access ramp may experience major impacts."2 The second flaw involves the data RTI International used for its analysis. The ranges reported to achieve a 95 percent confidence interval clearly demonstrate that the estimates are based upon flawed sample data.3 Third, RTI International used the a model to forecast economic impact that cannot possibly reflect the realities of the situation. The model used does not reflect the unique geography of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands and the resultant lack of close substitutes for employment and leisure. With respect to geography, the 8 villages are 1 Economic Analysis of ORV Use Regulations in Cape Hatteras National Seashore, RTI International, p. 3-26 2 Economic Analysis of ORV Use Regulations in Cape Hatteras National Seashore, RTI International, p. 3-33 3The data collected through the survey yielded an estimate of 344,999 vehicle trips on the beach in the Seashore between April and November 2009 with a 95 percent confidence interval ranges from 285,696 vehicle trips to 405,302 vehicle trips. The estimate of passengers is 768,948 passengers with a 95 percent confidence interval of 625,928 passengers to 911,968 passengers. Mean per person per trip value for Hatteras: \$11.14 95% confidence interval: (\$6.27 to \$39.03). Per person per trip loss from beach closure: \$5.27 to \$0. *ibid.*, pp. 2-7, 3-14 Page 16 of 22 surrounded either by park owned property or Pamlico Sound—each village is an island with the park being the sea. As such, the primary source of economic activity is park visitation. As per Superintendent Hanks' input into the Mission 66 plan for development, the park service fully expected to create this type of dependency and to support the village economies rather than create new development within the seashore.4 The current reality is that the villages exist at the discretion of the park service. For example, consider the current Bonner Bridge controversy. The park service holds title to Pea Island but delegates management to USFWS. The replacement of the bridge has been blocked by USFWS for 18 years because USFWS does not want to continue to allow maintenance of Highway 12 and the power lines that supply electricity to the villages. Without the bridge and the road, residents will find it extremely difficult to gain access to the mainland. Without the bridge and road, it was impossible to sustain visitation and the economy at 1963 levels, let alone at today's levels. Bottomline, the model used does not allow for a closed economy such as the one that exists on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. As I will demonstrate below the costs of the proposed rule are substantial while the benefits are minimal. COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS Summary of Resource Management Strategies and Costs Over the years CHNSRA resources have been managed under a variety of plans. These plans are summarized below. Management Policies Annual Resource Management Cost1 Percentage Change over 2004 Annual Protection Cost1 Percentage Change over Interim Plan 1992-2003 Management N/A N/A N/A N/A 2004 Management -- Superintendent's Order 07:ORV Management \$ 223,349 N/A N/A N/A Interim Plan Prototype & Interim Plan (2005-2007) \$ 508,500 228% \$ 1,147,500 N/A Consent Decree (2008-2010) \$ 813,000 364% \$ 1,481,500 129% FEIS \$ 943,950 423% \$ 1,956,100 170% 1 2004 Management Costs as per Interim Plan, Interim Plan and Consent Decree Costs as per FEIS. The cost of the recent resource management policies are due in part to a more proactive approach to shorebird protection. The cost increases reflect increased monitoring with daily reports of every single nesting bird and chick. The cost increases also reflect increased predator control—every bird and animal that dares to come near historic nesting areas must run a gambit of leg hold traps. These traps have killed and/or injured other species of concern (Diamondback Terrapins) and even domestic animals. And if a favored bird (Piping Plover, Oystercatcher, or Colonial Waterbird) finds itself in distress, the NPS will either transfer the bird to long term care (2010 Oystercatcher report) or administer antibiotics/steroids on site (conversation with turtle patrol). While the NPS resource management costs are a matter of record, little has been done to document the impact of the more aggressive management policies that have been implemented over the past 7 years. These policies have sharply reduced the options available to park visitors. For example, under the 1992-2003 Management 4 "His plans encouraged park development near the villages for the convenience of the public, to promote village growth, and to concentrate development so to leave miles of beach front undisturbed. In the end, Hanks' prospectus determined the location and layout of most major developments at the park, including the fishing piers and camping sites." *ibid.* p. 162 Page 17 of 22 policy resource closures were erected to protect nests, rarely interfered with access, and never prevented through traffic between ORV ramps. This is NO longer true. Under current management, resource closures are erected NOT simply to protect nests but rather are based upon previous nests and "courtship" behavior, thus resource closures begin as early as mid March. Resource closures are larger and almost always extend to the shoreline. Finally, resource closures for turtle nests extend the time line for restricted access well into October. The end result is that an average of 25-30% of the shoreline is closed to "all" users and 65-70% of ORV use areas are closed. Through traffic between ORV ramps is a thing of the past and access points are frequently closed to "all" users, making them parking lots to nowhere. Finally, from May 1 to September 15, ORV access is limited to 6 am through 10 pm. This time restriction effectively shuts down spring and fall game fishing and shuts down the dawn and dusk time frames serious anglers cherish. Rather than attempt to determine the impact of the above noted restrictions, RTI International simply assumes that less ORV use is a positive for all visitors other than those who utilize ORVs and for wildlife. As I will demonstrate below the positive impacts on wildlife have not been realized. With respect to the impact on visitors, as documented in public meeting transcripts and comments submitted throughout the planning processes, the negative impact 1) on both ORV and pedestrian users, and 2) on the quality of life for the local community has been substantial. Further evidence of the negative impact on the local community can be found in the general attitude toward park personnel and the numerous incidents of stress related illnesses that have been reported by individuals who have been actively involved in this issue. RTI never mentions any of the above evidence. RTI does look at visitation but states that more aggressive resource protection policies have only been in effect since 2007 (3 years as of the writing of the cost benefit report) thus, RTI concludes that there is insufficient data to make a reliable estimate of average visitation.5 This is not accurate. Instead, the data clearly shows that while visitation has been somewhat variable, each pullback has been followed by a new growth spurt. The most recent growth spurt (1997-2003) resulted in an average of 2.67 million visitors per year. Contrary to RTI, more aggressive resource protection policies began in 2004 or 7 years ago not 3 years ago. At this point, visitation dropped to 1993 levels. As restrictions have continued to increase, visitation has remained at or below 1993 levels. That is, this new level of visitation has persisted throughout the 7 years of aggressive management policies which is enough time to make an accurate estimate of annual visitation. 5 Economic Analysis of ORV Use Regulations in Cape Hatteras National Seashore, RTI International, p. 2-5 Page 18 of 22 This new level of visitation represents a 17.4% decline from the most

recent growth spurt and a 24% decline from the last peak in 2002. Based upon the fact that the local economy is almost "exclusively" dependent upon tourism resulting from park visitation, this substantial "long term" decline has drained local businesses' emergency reserves. As such businesses are increasingly questioning their long term viability. Other businesses have closed and foreclosures on rental properties are commonplace. Businesses made these point quite clear when surveyed but RTI seems to have ignored it. So how has the NPS responded to the mounting complaints and the sharp decline in visitation? Just like RTI, the NPS attributes declines to other factors (i.e. the economy, gas prices, etc.). Actually the NPS goes further telling the residents they will get used to the "new normal" and that they will see new business opportunities for things like ecotourism and bird watching. 7 years later, the community is still waiting for the influx of ecotourism and bird watchers. Benefits Piping Plover Data for the Piping Plovers are summarized below. Management Strategy Fledge Rate (Chicks/Pair) 1992-2003 Management 0.63 2004 Management -- Superintendent's Order 07:ORV Management 0.00 Interim Plan Prototype & Interim Plan (2005-2007) 0.87 Consent Decree (2008-2011) 0.846 this is necessary look at the 2004 the fledge rate of 0.00. 7 Does this fledge rate indicate that the 2004 Management policy was a failure? If you look at the weather conditions you will see that there was a T-storm with high winds on 6/10 followed by Hurricane Alex on 7/31. These two weather events likely resulted in the total loss of all chicks for 2004. What about the 0.87 and 0.84 fledge rates for the 3 years under the Interim Plan and the 4 years under the Consent Decree? Are these results demonstrative of the success of the Interim Plan and the Consent Decree relative to the 1992-2003 Management Policy? Or are the Interim Plan and the Consent Decree fledge rates related to other factors--i.e. the lack of any storm activity? The data suggest that the difference between fledge rates for the recent management policies and those reported for the 1992-2003 policies ARE weather related. Stated more specifically, if you remove the 4 years with storm activity<sup>8</sup> from the 1992-2003 Management period, the recalculated fledge rate is 0.85 which is right in line with the 0.87 and 0.84 fledge rates for "good" weather years included in the Interim Plan and the Consent Decree, respectively. In fact, based upon this data, I submit that the different management policies have had NO impact on the productivity of Piping Plover. 6 2010 Resource report adjusted to include 6 Preliminary data from the 6/23 through 6/29 Resource Management Summary 13 pairs, and 8/10 report indicates 10 fledged chicks. 7 Economic Analysis of ORV Use Regulations in Cape Hatteras National Seashore, RTI International, p. 2-5 8 Hurricane Allison on 6/3/1995, Tropical Storm Arthur on 6/17/1996, Hurricane Danny on 7/16/1997, and Tropical Storm Arthur on 7/24/2002 with fledge rates of 0.5, 0.21, 0.27, and 0.00, respectively NPS and USFWS use a 10 year time frame for assessing success or failure of a particular policy. As indicated by RTI when dealing with visitation, the reason for this practice is to filter out noise, such as the impact of weather or extraneous factors. To see why Page 19 of 22 Breeding Pairs 0 5 10 15 20 25 30 35 40 45 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 Year Breeding Pairs 0.00 0.20 0.40 0.60 0.80 1.00 1.20 1.40 1.60 1.80 Fledge Rates Breeding Pairs Fledge Rates Oystercatchers Data for the Oystercatchers are summarized below Management Strategy Fledge Rate (Chicks/Pair) 2000-2003 0.36 2004 Management -- Superintendent's Order 07:ORV Management 0.63 Interim Plan Prototype & Interim Plan (2005-2007) 0.43 Consent Decree (2008-2011) 1.00 For example, the fledge rate observed under the Consent Decree appears to be higher than that of previous policies. However, as the underlying data demonstrate, the Consent Decree fledge rate is being unduly influenced by the most recent two observations (2010 and 2011).<sup>9</sup> With the limited data set it is impossible to say whether these fledge rates will repeat. Based upon the past trend, it seems likely the fledge rates will fall again then return to a slightly higher rate than in 2008--that is will continue the "long term" trend of modest improvement. With respect to the population, the "long term" improvement in productivity has not translated into population growth. To the contrary, the Oystercatcher population at CHNSRA has continued to decline. Continued spending on productivity in the face of a declining population is a misallocation of resources. Colonial Waterbirds Due to the fact that CHNSRA management has changed the way it counts these colonies, it is impossible to make any statements regarding the benefits derived from new management techniques. Sea Turtles The main difference in management related to turtles is the Consent Decree ban on night driving. The rationale was that lights cause false crawls. The average false crawl ratio under the consent decree (2008 through 8/10/11) is 0.88. This figure is not statistically different from the average for the period of 2000-2008 of 1.0. Furthermore, the first recorded instance of a turtle take by a vehicle occurred during 2010 when the night driving ban was in effect. Is it possible that without the ban the driver would have had his lights on and would have seen the turtle? If this was intentional, would the presence of other night time users served as a deterrent? I submit that the answer to the latter is a resounding YES. This statement is based upon past experience. Furthermore, anglers that regularly frequent the beaches at dawn have helped notified park service resource personnel of nests missed by the morning patrols. Quite simply, the night time ban on ORV use has been counterproductive. <sup>9</sup> The 6/23 through 6/29 Resource Management Summary reports 17 breeding pair and the 8/10 report indicates 27 fledged chicks. Of particular note is that NO one management policy includes more than 4 observations. As indicated by RTI when dealing with visitation, the limited data set makes it impossible to evaluate any single policy. Page 20 of 22 Summary Despite the costs (i.e. the mass killing of wildlife thereby threatening the natural balance between predators and prey, adding nearly \$600,000 to the NPS resource management bill, and taking actions that have contributed to a 17.4% decline in visitation and stressed the local economy), new management policies have NOT resulted in improved productivity numbers for Piping Plovers nor have these actions halted the decline in the Oystercatcher and other non ESA listed populations at CHNSRA. Despite this lack of success, the DOI/NPS plan to expand upon the previous unsuccessful efforts to boost shorebird productivity/populations and protect sea turtles. The estimated cost of the new resource protection efforts is nearly \$3 million dollars. This figure represents a 4-fold increase over 2004 resource management and a 2-fold increase over Interim Plan resource management and protection costs. With respect to cost to the local economy, the NPS continues to write off the cost to the local community. RTI does make note of the significant impact on local businesses but then perpetuates past practice of defining the ROI so broadly as to negate the recognized impacts on the local economy. Finally, RTI ignores existing data and instead substitutes unreliable estimates of cost and a model that does not take into account the unique characteristics of the local economy to estimate future costs. Actually, RTI recognizes the limitation of their data and models when they state that calculating quantitative estimates was not possible.<sup>10</sup> Instead RTI chooses to provide "a qualitative ranking of the action alternatives relative to the no-action alternatives for the different categories of benefits and costs." As I demonstrated above, we DO have reliable data as to the cost of the more aggressive policies that have been implement over the past 7 years--that is, a 17.4% decline in visitation, considerable dissatisfaction with opportunities to use park resources, and an erosion of the relationship between the park service and the local community. RTI and the NPS simply choose to ignore it. With respect to what we can expect of the proposed rule and expanded protection efforts, comments from the DEIS/FEIS demonstrate that this trend in user dissatisfaction and tension between the community and the park service will continue to increase. In some cases businesses simply refuse to serve park personnel. With respect to the costs to the economy, Cape Cod National Seashore can provide some insight. Cape Cod National Seashore is similar to Cape Hatteras National Seashore in that they derive a good deal of their tourist income from park visitation. In 1996, following the implementation of similar efforts at Cape Cod visitation fell by 10% and has remained at that lower level. Insofar as the villages of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands are surrounded by park service property and are considerably smaller in terms of land mass available for private enterprise, there are less non park related activities available and it is quite likely that the decrease in visitation will

exceed the 10% observed at Cape Cod. As for the impact on the local economy, Cape Cod's economic base did contract with many businesses that catered to park visitors closing entirely and others scaling way back. As RTI notes, however, communities with a larger economic base are better able to absorb impact for reduced visitation than smaller economies who depend more directly on park visitation. The latter is a description of the 8 villages of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands that have a total population of 4,000. What did RTI have to say about the potential costs to such small communities? That they will experience major economic impacts.<sup>11</sup> That is, collect data from Cape Cod on business contractions and closings and expect that the economies of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands will experience much higher rates of business failures and loss of income due to reduced park visitation. <sup>10</sup> Economic Analysis of ORV Use Regulations in Cape Hatteras National Seashore, RTI International, p. 3-32 <sup>11</sup> *ibid.* 3-33 The most egregious nature of all this is that the NPS/DOI "ensured" that the local economy would be "exclusively" dependent upon park visitation when the NPS/DOI "insisted" on acquiring all the land surrounding the villages on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands and thereby limited the amount of land available for village expansion. The NPS has to know that this plan will substantially change the lives of the 4,000 residents of the villages on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands, causing many residents to leave the Islands and resulting in a much lower standard of living for those residents who remain. Yet the DOI asserts that "this document will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities under the RFA (5 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)." and the OMB has asserted that "This rule will not have an effect of \$100 million or more on the economy. It will not adversely affect in a material way the economy, productivity, competition, jobs, the environment, public health or safety, or State, local, or Tribal governments or communities." With respect to the benchmark of \$100 million, you could shut down the entire rental industry on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands and not reach this figure. <sup>12</sup> As such you must look to the relative impacts. In this regard, the population of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands totals a mere 4,000 and have an average per capita income of only \$40,000. Furthermore, as per RTI, "Almost all of the businesses in the Seashore villages are small."<sup>13</sup> and rely directly on park service visitation. These businesses have already endured 7 years of losses associated with a 17.4% decline in park visitation. And, as I have demonstrated above stand to endure at least another 10% decline as a result of this new rule. Even RTI admits that there will be a significant impact on businesses that rely directly on park visitation in areas impacted by the new rule which includes every village on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. This being the case, the only way the DOI and the OMB can possibly assert that the economic impact will not be material is if they have been misled or if they have chosen to turn a blind eye to reality.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13363	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993
<b>Name:</b>	Davies, Robert b				
<b>Received:</b>	Aug.24,2011 00:00:00				
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	Letter				
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Under the proposed rule all ORV use will be subject to resource closures (which is unlawful according to Enabling Legislation, USC 459 that carries a mandate to develop the beaches for public recreation). Cape Point is expected to be closed to ORV use from March to August. This is unnecessary if NPS would manage the resources to allow people to use their park beaches. Sadly the NPS has no intention to accommodate the public. In a recent interview for the National Parks Traveler Mike Murray commented about plover habitat restoration at Cape Point: He was quoted: "Should we go out and bulldoze ponds in different locations? You've got to recognize that it'd be adverse modification of piping plover habitat. "Superintendent Murray said. " If the habitat is naturally occurring there you can't go mess it up in order to ensure access and then try to spend millions to create habitat further west. It is where it is. "				

Mr. Murray's approach violates the law and continues to support the SELC agenda to restrict and remove vehicles from NPS lands. He views the CHNSRA beaches purely as wildlife habitat and ignores the legal mandate to develop the beaches for human water sports. His position shows a lack of understanding of the forces that created the present conditions at Cape Point: Before the 1930's Cape Point habitat was completely natural (although heavily grazed by cattle). During the great depression decade the topography was changed by man to create dune fields that would protect roads to develop a new park for the working people of the nation. In the 1950's the Dredge Hole was dug by man to supply sand just north of the point. In the 1960's straggler piping plovers discovered the bare sands around the Dredge Hole to be a prime nesting area. In the 1980's the NPS began their destruction of plover habitat by installing closures around the Dredge Hole which encouraged vegetative growth and new dune fields between the Dredge Hole and the ocean. Similar closures at other locations have also reduced the bare sand beaches compressing recreational usage and possible bird habitat together. Thus there is no virgin natural habitat at Cape Point. This mix of sand, grass and dune has all been influenced by the actions of man. Restoration to correct the NPS destruction would certainly be appropriate. Increased corrective manipulation to intentionally create superior plover habitat to both improve fledging and provide public access to the recreational beaches would be preferred. Most of the area between the Dredge Hole and the Ocean may have once been bird habitat but is no longer utilized due to the vegetative growth which provides concealment for predators. Any change of topography is not an "adverse modification of piping plover habitat "but an improvement that can be scientifically structured to benefit the plovers. A heavy dose of common sense to beach management is necessary at CHNSRA. The system of buffer closures operated under the Consent Decree has not aided avian survival. The same program is carried through the proposed regulation and promises no further improvement meanwhile the public is denied lawful recreation and economic benefit. These dynamic beaches are not hospitable to wildlife. The NPS would prefer to disregard their data of poor success and maintain that whatever a creature picks as beach habitat, "It is where it is. " They view this as the cheapest tool for NPS management with no regard to the human cost of their actions. This decision fails a cost/benefit analysis (see attached analysis by Luizer). Furthermore it leads to a violation of the parks enabling legislation that carries a mandate to develop the beaches for public recreation. Cape Point and the inlet spits are the most precious beaches for public use and must be protected or developed for that purpose. The NPS must change its resource management practices to adhere to that mandate. The present buffer system must be corrected.

Throughout the development of the EIS/RULE the NPS has been adamant to provide habitat for any bird species requested by Audubon. The law is quite clear as to the action NPS must take should they persist in that effort. The NPS will need to absorb the costs of material and personnel to provide for the keeping of any birdlife so selected. Since this is purely an NPS choice they can not pass the costs along as extra fees to the public. The law requires that areas especially adaptable for recreation shall be developed for recreation. Every inch of shoreline has proven adaptable for the types of recreation cited in that law. Most of the beaches have been amenable to vehicular operation to facilitate public access for those recreational pursuits. The NPS has made an issue about their desire for predictability. This can be achieved simply by designated Recreational Corridors to encompass: 1)

Access roads and trails including interdunal trails 2) Access ramps 3) All beach front both ocean and sound defined as the land between the existing tide line and a point 100 meters from that tide line. This area will "float" with the dynamic conditions encountered at CHNSRA. 4) These corridors will be BFA ( Buffer Free Areas ) 5) There would be no pre-nesting established in the BFAs. Such closures would be in more productive areas. Bird protection or keeping can be performed by any method chosen by NPS outside of the BFA's. It would be recommended that NPS consult with other agencies or authorities as to the best methods for each species e.g. vegetation control, pond construction and water management, dredge spoil islands etc.

The NPS has shown a penchant to change names to remove vestiges of recreation from their new image of CHNSRA as a wildlife sanctuary. Consider these names: 1) " Canadian Hole " In my 40 years experience on the Outer Banks this sound side location was always named to represent its popularity for swimming and sailing by our visitors from Canada. Most of them spoke French and wore unique bathing attire. NPS renamed this " Haulover " 2) "Dredge Hole" Rather than admit this body of water near Cape Point was man made, the NPS considers this a "Salt Pond" with its natural connotations. 3) "Recreational Area" After the NPS had acquired enough land parcels to insure the establishment of their new park they were free to drop their subterfuge from the title of CHNSRA. Earlier the NPS "salesmen" portrayed the park as an attraction that would provide a higher standard of living for the islanders in order to grab their land. The ORV Rule must use the legal title of "Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area" and that very title should be used on all park signage and publications for the visitors.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13364    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13365    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13366    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Sample comments to Superintendent Mike Murray, Cape Hatteras National Seashore:

Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13367	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13368	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13369	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I SUPPORT regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.



---

**Correspondence ID:** 13370    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13371    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As a biology student I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13372    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As a frequent vacationer on the Outer Banks, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13373    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do NOT permit unrestricted use of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore by off-road vehicles. There should be more areas

set aside exclusively to protect wildlife. Off-road vehicles should be allowed in areas where wildlife are not at risk, and they are especially at risk in nesting areas. Human beings need to have respect for the lives of other species besides only themselves. Animals already suffer too much because of human selfishness, carelessness, and greed. Enough is enough!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13374    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.

Yet this proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13375    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We must stand firm in protecting our most treasured national resources from the incursion of destructive and needless influences.

Please do a right thing here.

All the best and then some,

Michael Raysses

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13376    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I write to you this day and submit my public comment relative to the new proposed "rule" intended to govern the use by the public of Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area authorized by Congress in the year 1937 and finally established by the National Park Service (NPS or the "service") in 1953 after some, but not all of the lands currently constituting the "Seashore" were acquired by the Department of the Interior in order to satisfy the requirements established primarily within 16 USC 459 sec.3.

As the proposed rule stands, it blatantly violates the "Enabling Legislation" 16 USC 459 sec. 3, (1937) authorizing the establishment of the "Seashore" (hereafter referred to as the Seashore or CHNSRA) as well as the "Redwoods Amendment" 16 USC 459 sec. 1a-1 of 1978.

I therefore reject and vehemently oppose most all of the provisions set forth in this proposed "rule" for the reasons outlined below as most are based upon either flawed science, a lack of science, studies conducted with a predetermined outcome and in many cases, studies that are out of date or have been peer reviewed by the authors of same which violates peer review protocol and in many cases, federal law.

It is apparent that NPS doesn't quite understand, at least in this instance, that it is the right of the congress to dispose of public property, not the Park Service. In fact, that privilege does not event extend to the President of the United States as per our Constitution. Though congress has given NPS the ability to establish needful rules and regulations, at no time has the law provided NPS with the ability to lawfully execute this sort of action in an instance where such an action would be in violation of federal law extant. Nor does law exist that gives the ability to NPS to ignore regulation enacted by congress and signed into law by the President However, relative to CHNSRA, that is precisely what NPS intends to do if RIN 1024-AD85 is put into place.

Case and point is 16 USC 459 sec.3 which declares quite succinctly that the Seashore is to be developed "as needed" for

recreational use. And that the "service" hold the remaining portion of the area in "reserve" until it is needed for it's intended purpose, that of a recreational area; providing that is adaptable and needed for recreation. Congress set no limit on the areas that can be developed for recreational use within the seashore, nor did they limit what form of recreational use could take place. Except to say "swimming, sailing, fishing, boating and other recreational activities of a similar nature, which shall be developed for such uses as needed".

Unfortunately for the American public, NPS seeks to change the meaning of this legislative passage by interpreting the verbiage in the sentence following as though it said that the remaining portion of the area is to be permanently preserved when it does in fact state "permanently reserved" instead. The understanding of the use of the word "reserved" in this instance is the key to realizing the intent of congress and the enabling legislation as a whole. It is, after all, the use of the word "reserved" that enables the development of the Seashore for recreational use as needed and clearly establishes recreational use to be the primary purpose of this area, not preservation of wildlife or primitive wilderness as NPS would have the public believe. Though the last portion of the single paragraph that comprises 16 USC 459 sec.3 does contain the words "and no development or undertaking for the convenience of visitors may take place that would be incompatible with the preservation of the unique flora, fauna and physiographic conditions now prevailing in this area"; this clearly applies only to such areas held in "reserve" until they are needed for recreational development and use as stipulated by congress.

Another blatant example of the disregard that NPS has for congressional law deals with the obvious intent of the "service" to violate provisions set forth by congress within 16 USC 459 sec. 1a-1 otherwise known as the Redwoods Amendment. Here the congress clearly informs NPS that they are not to conduct any activity that would result in significant derogation of the mission established by congress for this area unless and until the "service" has "direct and specific authorization by congress" to do so. The proposed new rule as proffered by NPS will in fact dramatically alter previous management policy (pre- 2008 Consent Decree for the Seashore) and will in fact limit recreational opportunity severely, resulting in derogation of the mission established for this area. Contained within the 2010 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) as published by NPS, is a statement by the "service" which explains that the Redwoods Amendment was intended to enhance section 1 of the "Organic Act" but not intended to institute separate management policies. Though both of these statements are true, NPS willfully ignores the fact that it is the individual "enabling legislations" that dictate how various areas are to be managed and developed and that without the aforementioned "direct and specific" authorization from congress to do so, the "service has no legal authority to implement the proposed new "rule".

Furthermore, at no time in our nation's history has the Congress given the NPS the ability or legal authority to regulate commerce outside of the bounds of the areas for which it is responsible. The implementation of RIN 1024 AD85 aka the "rule", will have that effect much the same way the Consent Decree of 2008 has done. That same decree has been an enormous factor in the downturn of the economies of both Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. Some sixty businesses have failed since the inception of the decree and its immense beach closures. And also, some 400 homes (and counting) are now in foreclosure on the islands. The proposed new "rule" will exacerbate this problem further by denying the American public access to beaches by Off Road Vehicle (ORV) use for a significant and fiscally important portion of the year upon which our economy is largely based. The proposed closures outlined within the "rule" will serve, and have with the Consent Decree alone, already served, to drive the visitors upon which our economy is based, to seek recreational opportunity elsewhere. Proof of this may be found across the internet at various sites which deal with visitation to the Seashore and perusal of same will repeatedly reveal former visitors stating that they have no intention of returning to the area if NPS implements this "rule" as intended. As such, NPS unlawfully limits commerce on the islands by depriving visitors, the majority of which operate ORVs on our beaches, from access to the Seashore in areas which have been traditionally and lawfully accessed before, and since the Seashore was established in 1953. In addition, NPS will deprive local commercial fishermen their congressional guaranteed right of access to our beaches, upon which their livelihood depends. This further demonstrates an attempt at regulation of commerce by the "service". This regulation comes in many forms but all points to the same agenda which is to limit access.

For someone that lives on Hatteras Island and has experienced the effects of the Consent Decree, I have extraordinary difficulty understanding where the NPS purported two million odd visitors have been every year since 2008. I have never seen our beaches so empty in all the years before, and after, I moved to Hatteras Island. Nor have I seen the beaches so thoroughly inaccessible due to various resource closures. Just where are all of these people Mr. Murray? If NPS is relying upon the traffic counter at Whalebone Junction to accumulate this data, the number might make sense. But then every delivery vehicle, law enforcement, or emergency vehicle, every resident's car or truck that goes off island to shop is counted at least twice. As an example, there are two companies that provide bagged and block ice to the islands virtually every day beginning in the spring and running through the fall fishing season. There are routinely at least three UPS trucks on Hatteras Island every day which alone would count for six visitors based upon the technology utilized by the "service" It doesn't take much thought to understand how quickly those numbers will add up and that fails to include the other delivery, service, transit, local, and assorted other vehicles including those that belong to NPS that pass that point every day. A classic example of how NPS has skewed visitation numbers to present figures that would lean toward the "agenda" is when the "service" sponsored economic impact study went to consider visitation in the summer. Beach access ramp 43 was chosen over the considerably more oft utilized beach access ramp 44, only a couple of hundred yards away. That alone serves as a prime example of NPS again violating federal law and even executive order by not presenting to the public sound science; nor was this supposed data available for public comment in a timely manner as required by the National Environmental Policy Act. (NEPA).

NPS has proposed the creation of "Vehicle Free Areas" (VFA's) which are in conflict with both executive orders 11644 (Nixon 1972) and also 11989 (Carter 1977). Within both E.O.'s NPS was given six months to determine which areas of (in this case the Seashore) would remain open and which areas would be closed to ORV traffic. In both cases, NPS determined that the entire Seashore should remain open to vehicular access. This determination was made again in 1978 when an Interim Management Strategy (IMS) for management of the Seashore was promulgated with NPS and local input. This same IMS was used and implemented by former superintendent Belli, with the exception of fee or permit based access and served as "service" policy until the promulgation of the 2007 IMS under current superintendent Murray which recognized the use of virtually all of the Seashores beaches that were considered safely accessible; excepting seasonal closures which occurred in front of the villages for

reasons of pedestrian safety during the busy summer months. (The superintendent again did not institute a fee or permit policy.) As such, by default, NPS recognized that the traditional routes of egress and transport were acceptable and not detrimental to the resource and allowed same for almost 40 years which does not include the many years of public vehicular use prior to the authorization and ultimately the establishment of CHNSRA in 1953. This was also substantiated by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) when they issued a Finding Of No Significant Impact (FONSI) prior to the 2007 IMS being issued and recorded in the Federal Register.

It is also true that contained within E.O. 11989 (Carter 1977) is a caveat wherein the Superintendent must show, prior to closing an ORV route or "trail", that use of said route either is causing or will cause significant adverse impact to the resource, which no superintendent of this Seashore has ever been capable of doing. Therefore, the proposed VFA's and permanent year round closures of Bodie Island Spit, the South end of Hatteras, aka "False Point", the Northeast end of Ocracoke Island, and the area known as South Point, also on Ocracoke, are both arbitrary and capricious and in violation of E.O. 11989. If NPS is so vehement about obeying the respective E.O.'s as they state they are, then they must obey all of the established requirements, not just those that seek to limit access to our Public Lands. It should also be pointed out that in accordance with 16 USC 459, the land overlaid by the as of yet congressionally approved wildlife refuge known as PEA Island National Wildlife Refuge is by law, very much a part of CHNSRA and contains near 13 miles of previously established VFA which visitors to that area may, and do, already enjoy, and remains uncontested in that no attempt at restoring ORV access to this area has been mounted. Until the congress deems this as a separate entity apart from CHNSRA, it remains part of the Seashore and as described within the law extant and by law is the responsibility of NPS to maintain and must be so recognized to include species nesting numbers.

Though NPS maintains that this area is not within their realm of management (which by law is untrue), and until the "service" can prove that nesting, regardless of species, is determined not by an ecosystem as a whole, but by imaginary man made geographical boundaries, the species that chose to nest on Pea Island need counted as part of the Seashores overall populations. The same would hold true for Cora June Island which is located just a few hundred yards from Hatteras Island, by the Ferry Channel.

Other issues with the proposed VFA designation include the following. As written, mobility impaired individuals such as myself will lose access to significant portions of the Seashore as without transport, I and others will have no means to transit the dune line with our equipment in order to enjoy our beaches. This would be in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) as it is discriminatory. Vehicular egress to the beaches in the proposed VFA's will require that mobility impaired persons will only be allowed access in front of the villages and not in other VFA areas away from same. Requiring a vehicle operator to drop off a mobility impaired individual and return to an ORV access point poses a safety hazard in the event of injury, storms or even something as simple as the need to use restroom facilities. NPS also operates under the assumption that someone who drops off a mobility impaired individual will have access to parking and able to access their vehicle in a safe and timely manner in order to assist the needs of the disabled individual. NPS also assumes that the person who "drops off" a mobility impaired individual is themselves capable of making the long trek back to the point where said individual was left. This will preclude many elderly persons from access to the proposed VFA. As someone who is 45% permanently disabled, and with no "chauffeur" and am therefore automatically disallowed from accessing many miles of beach that I and thousands of others have used for the traditional recreational activities outlined in the enabling legislation (16 USC 459 sec. 3) without harm or impairment to this treasured resource. Attention must also be drawn to the fact that the current, albeit undesignated VFA's within the bounds of the Seashore are the most underutilized areas of this beach system. One needs look no farther than the area beginning just north of beach access ramp 43 and extending to the old lighthouse location which day in and day out remains unused; as photographic documentation has proven over this last year. This same phenomenon can be discovered in most of the ocean area between the villages of Frisco and Hatteras as well as the vast majority of the beaches found on Ocracoke Island, throughout the year.

VFA's should only be imposed if it is found by the superintendant that they are necessary to protect the pedestrian visitor and the proposed rule should allow this flexibility. The area just north of beach access ramp 43, as described above, which has gone almost entirely unused by pedestrian visitors should have, and could have, been open to ORV use for the entire year. In sum, the VFA proposal is in conflict with both E.O. 11644 and 11989, the ADA, ignores the 13 miles of VFA on Pea Island, and will serve no other purpose other than to limit visitor access to our public beaches in conflict with 16 USC 459 sec.3 and the Redwoods Amendment. (16 USC 459 sec 1a-1)

It should also be pointed out that as the congress amended the enabling legislation in 1940 and formally changed the name of the Seashore to Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, it was stated that this area was set aside for the enjoyment and benefit of the American people; not "some" or "a few" but all.

The proposed VFA's will also serve to inspire user conflict and create resentment among user groups. Many individuals that visit the Seashore via ORV will, and already have become angry as they discover that the proposed access fee for ORV use is being used to pay for the infrastructure to support these VFA's while at the same time denying them access to those same areas. NPS policy dictates that the service is to minimize user conflict, not inspire it; which is in fact, beginning already.

Within the proposed rule, NPS claims that it seeks to mitigate fiscal impact upon the economy of the islands by the proposed VFA's and seeks to construct additional parking areas. Alternative F of the FEIS upon which this rule is based informs that the public that 130 odd new parking spots will be constructed along the ocean side of the Seashore in order to facilitate visitor access along with sundry supportive infrastructure. Assuming that NPS figures of two million odd visitors to the Seashore is even remotely close to being accurate, how is it that 136 new parking spots can possibly handle this volume of visitors? Especially since the majority of these new parking spots are to be located on Ocracoke Island and not on Hatteras Island where the majority of visitation occurs? This is nothing more than a thinly and poorly veiled effort by NPS to severely limit access to the Seashore. It is the words of Sandy Hamilton, and NPS employee who was involved in the failed Negotiated Rulemaking process, that echo in my mind. Her statement (referring to NPS) "that as long as we leave a small area open for access, we have

fulfilled the recreational mission of the Seashore" apparently sets the tone for the current and proposed actions by the "service". Apparently she never read, and is incapable of understanding the enabling legislation.

The fee based ORV access system proposed by NPS is discriminatory as it requires one user group to fund the infrastructure used by another. NPS proposes this system in a purported effort to recover the costs of yet to be constructed beach access ramps, parking areas, walkovers, and restroom facilities for pedestrian visitors within VFA's, but currently has no idea as to what the cost for this infrastructure will be or the costs of the permits necessary to do so. Currently, NPS has no funding to construct any of its proposed "improvements" and no idea of how long these so called improvements will take to construct. NPS has repeatedly demonstrated through the years that proper maintenance of the resources found within the Seashore is not something that the "service" is competent performing. Examples of this incompetence and fiscal mismanagement can be found in various areas of the Seashore. For example, the septic system at the Cape Point Campground which NPS has known for years needs upgraded, Bodie Island lighthouse which now stands as a dysfunctional eyesore, the mess that NPS created during the improvement of beach access ramp 44, the closure of the interdunal road extending from ramp 45 to ramp 49 in Frisco, the poor condition of the access road leading to ramp 49, and many others. A glaring example of these poor practices existed for many years in the form of a pothole at the entrance to ramp 44 which caused drivers to have to swerve into oncoming traffic exiting the beach from that ramp, in order to avoid damaging their tires and suspension.

Further objection to this proposed permit and user fee system deals with the fact that the American taxpayer already funds the NPS and will require that a segment of the population be taxed yet again for something they have been taxed for previously. Though I'm certain that his comment will fall on deaf ears, I insist that this fee based permit system as proposed by NPS be inexpensive or free of charge, as to not further burden the economy of the islands and harm the residents of same. An expensive fee based system will have the effect of driving visitors away from the Seashore and to other destinations. It is also true that establishing load capacity requirements will have the same effect as it is likely that any visitor who comes to the Seashore will find themselves unable to access the beaches that he or she just paid to visit and will never return again. NPS should not establish a system that is dependent upon sheer luck and timing to allow a visitor access to our beaches. And before the "service" begins to collect fees for ORV access, all of the proposed beach access ramps and interdunal roads should have already been constructed so that a meaningful figure for said permits can be established else said fees will be tantamount to outright theft.

NPS also sets forth a requirement that visitors attend a class about ORV use prior to the issuance of the proposed permit as well as setting forth requirements for equipment needed to access our beaches. I find this objectionable on several fronts. First of all, having driven on these beaches for thirty odd years without ever having been stuck, I don't need a class to tell me how to traverse these sands. I would submit that this is true for the majority of residents of the islands of which I am one as well as a significant number of visitors. In fact, on a per capita basis, I have personally spent more time digging out stuck NPS vehicles than I ever have visitors. I have also discovered that by in large, NPS vehicles do not carry the basic equipment that the "service" will require a visitor to carry. This raises an obvious question. How are a group of people, NPS employees, who are notorious for getting stuck in the often soft sands of our beaches, qualified to instruct other drivers how to negotiate the beach? In addition, the requirement for a jack and jack stand as set forth in the proposed rule will not help anyone who happens to be stuck; particularly in wet or soft sands and will pose yet another unreasonable financial burden upon the visiting public as well as residents of the islands likely resulting in many visitors making the choice to never return. A considerably more cost effective alternative which would facilitate continued visitation without burden, would be to make the proposed permits free of charge and available online as well as in the various tackle shops and realty offices much the same way the current Consent Decree required night driving permits are handled. In addition, more effective signage at the various access ramps would go a long way to provide important information to the visiting public. This would also eliminate the need for additional NPS staff, the need for physical structures to station staff to check permits, and in turn reduce the fiscal liability of the "service" and financial demand upon the American taxpayer. As I mentioned earlier, the proposed rule will also have an impact upon local commercial fishermen as they ply their trade from the beaches of the Seashore. Though NPS does allow traditional access for these hardworking individuals within the proposed VFA's, there is no mention of access to the inlets and spits upon which these individuals depend to ply their trade and feed their families. This access should be allowed as was mandated by congress within 16 USC 459. In addition, the requirement that these fishermen be able to provide a copy of a receipt to a local "fish house", not older than thirty days, ignores the reality that commercial fishing is a seasonal trade. A prime example of this is those licensed fishermen who practice their trade during the fall months during the mullet run. They cannot possibly cast for mullet until the run begins which is determined not by the calendar, but by the mullet. To deny them the right to fish simply because they have no recent receipt is to deny them the right to fish altogether. This portion of the proposed rule should be discarded as it poses an unfair burden upon these individuals and violates the tenants set forth within the lawfully enacted legislation authorizing the creation of the Seashore. Any local resident, with a valid commercial license should be allowed to fish, whether it is their first day or their last of the season, and without prior receipt. NPS also fails to define the term "fish house". Many of the licensed fall netters do not sell to a "fish house" as their catch is intended to be used as bait for licensed recreational fishermen and charter vessels and is subsequently sold to tackle shops instead of a "fish house", who also carry license to deal in legally procured fish stocks.

I also object to the proposed ban on night driving on our beaches for the majority of the year. This ban is based upon supposition rather than sound science as is required by NEPA. Were the Seashore located in Florida where sea turtle nests average some 600 nests per mile, it might make sense. However, here at CHNSRA, NPS statistics show that on average, there are just over 1.3 nests per mile, and an average of one nest and one false crawl per night. Therefore the likely hood of an ORV encounter with a sea turtle is slim at best considering the roughly 73 miles of beach comprising these islands. Though it is true that a sea turtle was run over on Ocracoke Island in 2011, this tragedy occurred at a time when night driving was already prohibited as per the Consent decree. NPS shoves the blame for this unfortunate accident upon the shoulders of visitors to the Seashore claiming that no patrols were active that night. However, the "service" fails to acknowledge that the Consent Decree also requires that bird monitors be in position to observe piping plover behavior from sunrise to sundown and it is therefore likely that it was an NPS employee that caused the demise of this animal. If and when NPS can come up with sound, reasonable, lawfully peer reviewed science that shows definitively that a night driving ban is necessary, I will accept it. Until then, I vehemently object to this

action. This again is addressed in E.O. 11989 wherein the superintendent must show considerable adverse effects before closing an ORV route to public access.

Additional objection to the proposed final rule including ALT F as described within the NPS published FEIS comes relative to the proposed size of buffers surrounding wildlife, in particular, the Piping Plover, *charadrius melodus*. These buffer recommendations stem from the Pawtuxet Protocols which have no scientific basis and in addition were largely peer reviewed by the authors in direct violation of United States Geological Service (USGS) peer review protocols rendering them unlawful. In addition, the buffers purported by NPS for non endangered or threatened species, are also excessive. Though species such as Least Terns, American Oystercatchers and the like are listed as "species of concern" by the state of North Carolina, within which the Seashore exists, Gordon Meyers, Chairman of the North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission, stated openly in his public comment to the NPS published Draft Environmental Impact statement (DEIS) that these birds did not need the level of protection proposed by NPS. In spite of which, NPS imposes them anyway, which serves no purpose other than to limit access to the Seashore and has resulted in tremendous economic harm to the islands communities.

NPS has also refused to consider this Seashore as a Traditional Cultural property in spite of the fact that it far exceeds the requirements set forth in the NEPA. Within which NPS is specifically instructed that TCP's do not only apply to Native American populations. Hence contacting the Tuscarora Nation to determine cultural significance of the area now considered the Seashore, once again NPS ignores the law and plays lip service to my community as well as the American public at large, in a clear effort to advance an agenda, limit access to our Seashore, and effectively destroy a traditional way of life and the communities which have served the public as well as the "service".

In closing, I am ashamed as an American citizen that NPS chooses to pursue such an action in defiance of the intent of congress and with such blatant violation of law extant. I am ashamed that I ever trusted Mike Murray, superintendent of this Seashore that I and a few thousand others call home. I am embarrassed that I took such pains to defend him against those who stated he would do greater harm to these islands than he did in Cape Cod. I am angry that my tax dollars are funding the destruction of a unique people and way of life that can only be experienced on these islands. I fear for my future and those people that constitute my island "family". It is a crime that through no fault of our own, a people that have cared for this resource since before the creation of the National Park Service and before the founding of this nation, should be so thoroughly tossed aside with such wanton disregard to their futures, their past, and the lives and futures of their children as well.

It is no small irony that the islands having just experienced the wrath of Hurricane Irene are now faced with the actions proposed by NPS which will have a far greater devastating effect for a much longer time than the storm could ever have done. At least we can rebuild after a hurricane. In time that storm becomes only a memory, albeit painful to many. What NPS intends will alter our lives forever.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13377	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	the proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.						

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13378	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Finally, after years of advocacy and litigation the National Park Service is poised to adopt regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.						

Yet the proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over.

Therefore, I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13379	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13380	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13381	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13382    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** TO whom it may ans should concern; My family and friends have enjoyed the NC Outer Banks for many years. Our access to those beaches for fishing and other recreation are the greatest times we share as a family. We have been befriended by the locals who depend on our "vacation" monies for their livelihood. We rent houses or hotel rooms, we buy food and eat at the local restaurants. We buy bait and fishing supplies and boogie boards and a host of other things while we are on the islands. I find it incredibly difficult to understand why any government agency would want to decimate a local economy to save a bird that will fly to the next beach or tree to nest there. They have been doing it through out the millenia, without any input from mankind or government kind. These types of rulings will negatively impact the region that I and my friends and family enjoy so much. The rights and livelihoods of many are being trampled for political correctness and gain All mandates for any rulings that directly affect such a large group of people should be decided by those people and not some panty waisted judge looking to make a name for himself as was/is this case. The NPS should not hold an entire community or the general population hostage under any circumstances, for any reason. That was never their intended roll nor should it become so. NPS was to keep the public lands open and available for many generations to enjoy, not to take them away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13383    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I AM COMPLETELY AGAINST THE USE OF ANY ORV USE IN SEASHORE AREAS!!!! I visit our local beach (Hammonasset State Park in CT) which is managed with wildlife in mind, and where ORVs are not permitted. My favorite activity at the beach is photographing wildlife in the areas around the beach. Visiting the park would be far less pleasant if noisy ORVs were allowed to "share" the space with human pedestrians. I cannot even imagine what the experience would be like for wildlife to be terrorized by these large, fast and noisy vehicles. I am sure the wildlife count would drop precipitously.

Please do not allow ORVs on the beach at Cape Hatteras National Seashore!!!

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13384    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please give this areas animals an opportunity to replenish itself. Do not allow vehicles to be on this area. There are plenty of other places for them to off road. Please at least designate an area away from the endangered species/plants homes so they can have a chance. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13385    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Gentlemen:

Cape Hatteras National Seashore was created to be a national "recreation" area. Since the suits began, public use of the area has become restricted, particularly in areas that are popular fishing venues. There are literally miles and miles of beach where birds and turtles can nest, but the fishing areas get shut down just as fishing season begins. It really has nothing to do with the birds and turtles in my opinion. The entire economy of the Outer Banks has been crushed by these ridiculous rulings.

These proposed regulations give the power to shut down these areas to someone's opinion. The areas most popular to fishing should be opened all day, every day, 24/7. Much of the island is closed to ORV's and that should be enough land for the birds and turtles to nest.

Thank you,

Cornell Bowden

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13386    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov



**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13387    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** 1. I believe that 'Alternative F' should not be implemented because it is based on flawed science, short-sighted assumptions, and was not created with any consideration toward the original mandate of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I believe that Alternative A is the only acceptable solution given that the Seashore has operated in large part without incident for the better part of a century without significant regulatory involvement from the NPS. It is a shame that the NPS has been negligent in its duty to create an ORV plan for nearly 40 years, and now feels the need to institute a plan that has not been well thought out, nor extensively studied for economic impact. By NPS and USFWS documentation the Pea Island Refuge actually lies "within" the Seashore boundaries. In fact there are actually about 75 miles of beach in the Seashore, not the 67 miles cited in the background section of the proposed rule introductory material 2. I oppose the proposed permit system. It amounts to nothing more than an additional tax to fund the notion that the NPS must educate the public on how to use its resource, if the park service is not able to support the permit system within their given budget, then it should not be implemented. 3. Alternative F requires building new ramps, parking lots, etc. The NPS discontinued the Bodie Island Lighthouse project because of a lack of funds. I assume that given the United States' current financial situation that the NPS will pay for these supposed improvements on the backs of taxpayers with the permit system. Hence, as I stated before, it is not a permit, it is a tax. I would also note that given the NPS's mandate via the Organic Act to protect native flora and fauna, it seems strange that the alternative chosen is one of the most, if not the most destructive in terms of building new roads, new parking lots, and new inter-dunal pedestrian routes. I would respectfully submit that Alternative A requires no new construction of any kind, and therefore no destruction of existing soil, sand, vegetation, etc. 4. Why is NPS deciding what animals/birds can live with in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area and which ones have to be killed? 5. As mandated by US law in USC Title 16, Chapter 1, Subchapter LXIII, Section 459 - any reference to Cape Hatteras National Seashore in the Federal Register notice should be changed to read "Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area" as this is the name Congress mandates the area shall be known as. I am angry at the ease by which the NPS continues to break this law because without its connection in the name, the concept of its importance is lost. 6. I object to the requirements that mandate that vehicles carry special equipment and object to the requirement that authorized persons may inspect vehicles to determine compliance. This is an open ended license for the park service personnel to stop and search any vehicle at anytime without suspicion or cause of wrong doing.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13388    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** ORV PROPOSED RULE (RIN 1024-AD85) My family comes to the OBX 3 times a year just for the OBX. We "tread lightly" but my daughter enjoys riding along the beach and seeing horses. The family time we have by being able to drive somewhere on the beach, park for the day and just enjoy ourselves is something that most people envy. Please do not take this family time away from us! OBX is an affordable vacation spot for my family. There is too much hustle bustle out there. At the OBX we can relax and really enjoy nature and the ocean. Please do not do this to us! Thank you,

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13389    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** 1. There should be no restrictions on night driving ? ORV routes should be accessible 24 hours a day. There is no hard factual evidence proving that lights from ORVs interfere with nesting turtles or other shorebirds. In reality, night driving deters ghost crabs 2. I oppose the proposed permit system. It amounts to nothing more than an additional tax to fund the notion that the NPS must educate the public on how to use its resource, if the park service is not able to support the permit system within their given budget, then it should not be implemented. 3. The table showing designated ORV routes should be changed to reflect ORV routes and access points as they were provided in 2007 under the interim management plan and as they currently physically exist. The table and the park service analysis for designated routes is flawed in that the table refers to ramps that do not exist and proposes to close public areas without an explanation why. 4. Why is NPS deciding what animals/birds can live with in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area and which ones have to be killed? 5. I believe that 'Alternative F' should not be implemented because it is based on flawed science, short-sighted assumptions, and was not created with any consideration toward the original mandate of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I believe that Alternative A is the only acceptable solution given that the Seashore has operated in large part without incident for the better part of a century without significant regulatory involvement from the NPS. It is a shame that the NPS has been negligent in its duty to create an ORV plan for nearly 40 years, and now feels the need to institute a plan that has not been well thought out, nor extensively studied for economic impact. By NPS and USFWS documentation the Pea Island Refuge actually lies "within" the Seashore boundaries. In

fact there are actually about 75 miles of beach in the Seashore, not the 67 miles cited in the background section of the proposed rule introductory material 6. The NPS is proposing to create new ORV access routes across areas that will go directly through areas that are currently protected and where ORV use is currently prohibited. OMB should request that the NPS explain the rationale behind which they are proposing to add new routes across protected land instead of using the routes and ORV corridors currently existing in the recreational area. 7. OMB should ask the NPS for a detailed map comparing the existing ORV ramps and corridors to the proposed designated ramps and corridors and ask for a total of the miles that the NPS intends to remove from the American public. 8. OMB should inquire about the cost of the new routes, time it will take to build the new routes, and if any additional studies would need to be done to construct the new routes. If new studies would be required, OMB should inquire about cost and amount of time the study would take.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13390    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America. It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan. However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specifi

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13391    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.

Speak out for wildlife. Visit [regulations.gov](http://regulations.gov) to oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife.

Finally, after years of advocacy and litigation by Defenders and our partners, the National Park Service is poised to adopt regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Yet the proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over.

We have made great progress in winning important protections for Hatteras' wildlife , and we can't lose traction now. ORV advocates want the entire seashore open to beach driving. Tell the Park Service instead that you support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13392    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13393    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I spent many summers on the beaches of Cape Hatteras in the 1960s and 70s when I was a young girl. It is shocking to me now to see how development has destroyed so much of the wild and pristine character of the island.

I urge you to adopt the strongest possible measures to protect wildlife from the destruction of the increasing number of beach drivers to preserve sea turtle and sea bird nesting areas.

All protections for wildlife, in my view, should be based on the best available science and be as rigorous as possible. We have lost too many species already due to human encroachment on critical habitat. Please take the strongest stand possible to preserve and protect the seashore's wild animals.

Thank you. Karen Coker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13394    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Re: ORV PROPOSED RULE (RIN 1024-AD85)

It has come to our attention that many of the beaches on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore have had closings, and/or restrictions place upon them for both ORV use and in some instances pedestrians. Our family has been vacationing on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands since 1974 and have found that in the last few years the decline in visitors and the number of business who've gone out of business due to the lack of revenue by these missing visitors. We spend thousands of dollars there each summer that helps support the local economy. These islands hold tourism as their main source of income which is obtained by many who fish and require access to stretches of beach that without access to ORV traffic makes fishing non-existent. In my homestate I participate with a group that buys and sells foreclosed homes. I receive daily lists of foreclosed properties for sale on Hatteras and Ocracoke islands. It is apparent by the huge number of homes on the OuterBanks that these beach restriction/closings are having an adverse affect on the only economy that the islands has....its tourists. If the tourists stop coming, the people who service them while they're visiting are being robbed of their financial security. Please reconsider your position for ORV and pedestrian traffic on the beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, a place that has been our home away from home for more than 35 years.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13395    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The current access areas should remain open to ORVs. Also, physical access to Oregon Inlet area should be available within 1 mile north and south of the bridge. This is a beautiful natural vacation area that should be enjoyed by many and it also helps the local economy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13396    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I want to state my opinion of the proposed beach closures on the outer banks. I have been going down there for the last 35 years

to fish and enjoy the beaches. The recent beach closures over the last few years have curtailed the trips that I have made to surf fish. I understand that there are even more beach closures proposed and I am totally against any further closures and the ones that have already been done. The park area is for the people and while I understand there are 3 species of wildlife that inhabit the area threaten, the recent closures made by the park service have taken access away from the people who own the area and have threaten the livelihood of many of the people in the immediate area. I am totally against any further beach closures and feel that the closures that have recently been put in place should be repealed. I feel that the park service has overstepped its bounds. While I'm on that subject, why are park rangers operating as traffic cops on NC 12. The state of North Carolina has a very capable Highway Patrol Dept and the Dare County Sheriff dept also patrols the area. Maybe the park ranger could actually monitor the park area and wildlife instead of being traffic cops, if that is their desire then they should join the highway patrol or the sheriff's dept and let the park rangers job be to monitor the national seashore. Just my opinion and alot of others too..

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13397    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13398    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

After reading over the Proposed Rule I am left wondering how The Rule will be enforced without hiring more NPS Officers. With several large projects being put on hold due to lack of funding I can not justify funding for additional NPS officers. The Bonner Bridge is in desperate need of repair and the Bodie Lighthouse is in the midst of work and is on hold. Not only will there be a need for NPS in the field there will also be a need for more administrative support due to the influx of processing and paperwork from the new permits. One of the main attractions of the Seashore is the ability to drive on the beaches. With so many restrictions on time/location/type of vehicle/number of riders in each vehicle tourism will go down, revenue will go down, and loss of jobs will follow. Please redirect your efforts on the decaying bridge and the unfinished lighthouse project.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13399    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

These beaches have been here and open to the people for many many years! Why change that now? The beach brings people from all over the world and helps support NC as a state by being a consumer and by helping the islanders make a living in an honest way! You just don't find a place like this just anywhere and these beaches are what these people have in common! ITS A WAY OF LIFE!!!!!!!!!!!! PLEASE DON'T TAKE OUR BEACHES!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13400    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

My hubby and I bird steward at Huguenot Memorial Park which blocks driving during nesting season for Royal Terns. Locals don't fully appreciate that their beach is the ONLY place on entire East Coast of Florida where these terns nest. They DO get used to the idea, even if begrudgingly. There are so many other compromises people have to make in their lives - allowing driving where it destroys species at risk is like allowing people to speed on streets posted to protect playing children because "they've always done it". What kind of society would we be if we allow humans liberties to drive on beaches in areas that destroy endangered wildlife? Key to Huguenot's success is a park manager willing to take the heat and stand by the park's convictions as well as honoring the public as much as possible. "Tough love" is sometimes best!

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13401	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Good Morning						

I appreciate that the NPS is apparently on the verge of adopting new regulations for driving on the shores of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. However I urge you to consider protecting specific wildlife nesting areas. As a birder, I know how important this is. I live in Oregon and there are signs posted on the shore alerting one to the snowy plover's nesting area and prohibiting activity in that area. It doesn't seem it would be that difficult to implement and it is THE RIGHT THING TO DO.

thank you.....Julie Parker

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13402	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I live in Volusia County, FL where an Incidental Take permit and associated Habitat Conservation Plan have been issued and are in operation. Despite the over 1 million vehicular visitors we get each year, impacts to nesting turtles and shorebirds is minimal. An effective plan will allow all users to co-exist and is necessary with today's population. Keep up the good work, by keeping current restrictions in place, people will adjust and animals will benefit with time.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13403	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Have any of you ever been to our beautiful free and open beaches of the Outer Banks, North Carolina? If you have then you would understand how important it is to keep our beaches ORV available and our beaches free and opened. Every day we hear on the news that the economy is down, and how small businesses are losing everything well Cape Hatteras would lose everything if you let the environmentalists take over. We understand that saving sea turtles and birds are important but humans have been here longer, and we need our beaches open. It is a way of life here on the Outer Banks, whether your a business, fishing, or taking your family to visit the Outer Banks. Some people have been taking generations of families here to the Outer Banks just to drive on the beach and fish and now that could all be taken away? It breaks my heart to see businesses begging for business now, and if the beaches are taken away it will close them completely. I am only 23 years old and I work for a local radio station here in Nags Head, East Carolina Radio and I realize that taking our beaches away might be the most devastating thing anyone could do to this area. Please listen and read all of our comments and help us out. This is the United States of America, home to FREEDOM to our people. Save our beaches!						

Have any of you ever been to our beautiful free and open beaches of the Outer Banks, North Carolina? If you have then you would understand how important it is to keep our beaches ORV available and our beaches free and opened. Every day we hear on the news that the economy is down, and how small businesses are losing everything well Cape Hatteras would lose everything if you let the environmentalists take over. We understand that saving sea turtles and birds are important but humans have been here longer, and we need our beaches open. It is a way of life here on the Outer Banks, whether your a business, fishing, or taking your family to visit the Outer Banks. Some people have been taking generations of families here to the Outer Banks just to drive on the beach and fish and now that could all be taken away? It breaks my heart to see businesses begging for business now, and if the beaches are taken away it will close them completely. I am only 23 years old and I work for a local radio station here in Nags Head, East Carolina Radio and I realize that taking our beaches away might be the most devastating thing anyone could do to this area. Please listen and read all of our comments and help us out. This is the United States of America, home to FREEDOM to our people. Save our beaches!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13404	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please keep our beaches free!!!!

**Correspondence ID:** 13405    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I noticed this summer something disturbing. Where ramps were closed due to turtles or birds, tourists had parked along the one Highway 12 and were walking over the dunes. Now for those of you that don't know this, Those dunes are just as precious as the birds, they protect the environment just as much or more so than our human involvement. Ask the National Parks about replanting those sea oats! They are vital part of keeping the dunes existing. But tourists were trampling them down. I witnessed tourists dragging kayaks, wind boards, and children in wagons over the precious sand dunes and sea oats. Now I'm not a scientist but I find it quite interesting. Where the tourists trampled over the dunes is the same spots now that Hurricane Irene cut inlets. Is this a direct result? I can't say. But I am sure of one thing. You cut off the beach access by closing the beach to ORV and more folks are going to trample more dunes and kill more sea oats. Kill the dunes and you kill the island. Kill the island and you kill they very things you are trying to protect. For years before environmentalists were concerned, the local population of the OBX, did a great job of working with park officials to protect the entire Island. These local folks don't even scream to FEMA and they are still stranded by Irene! (Unlike other storm ravaged persons and places). The locals are the ones that pick up the tourist's trash after they leave and look after the place because it's HOME.They know that Island like its their family. Leave them alone to take care of her as they see best.

**Correspondence ID:** 13406    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The beach access and the ORV access is not the problem, the lack of quick, damaging enforcement of the current is why we have problems! Don't forbid my entrance, punish those who disobey!

**Correspondence ID:** 13407    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect wild life crime loud off road vehicles.

**Correspondence ID:** 13408    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please leave access to Cape Hatteras open. While the country is struggling with many economic problems closing the beaches of the lower Outer Banks would be an economic disaster. There are plenty of dunes available for the birds to nest and still leave the beaches open to the public.

**Correspondence ID:** 13409    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13410    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please continue regulations that protect the shoreline wildlife on Cape Hatteras National Shoreline. The wildlife needs to be protected from vehicles in the nesting areas

**Correspondence ID:** 13411    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose allowing off-road vehicles on Cape Hatteras, as well as other National Seashores. Off-road vehicles destroy fragile habitats and vegetation. People can just get out and walk!

**Correspondence ID:** 13412    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13413    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** free our beaches

**Correspondence ID:** 13414    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please restrict the use of ORVs. I fully agree with the following statement: "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

**Correspondence ID:** 13415    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Most people that use ORVs on the beaches do so in a respectful manner, making sure not to tear stuff up or cause problems. they (including myself) take pride in North Carolina's beaches and take care of them. there are several dedicated groups of ORV owners and individuals that take care of protecting all kinds of wildlife and the beaches themselves, WITHOUT federal/state assistance, outside of the national park system. the same respect of others (people) and wildlife as well as the dunes themselves. this just opens the door for you(the federal government) to close all of the beaches to ORV.

ORV on the beaches of the outer banks is a favorite past time for many of the locals in the north east north carolina area, and from other parts of the country as well. of course i understand that there are a select few idiots, that do their best to damage stuff, and tear stuff up. im not speaking for them, im speaking for myself and hundreds of thousands of other ORV drivers that are

mindful of laws/regulations, and that take pride in our beaches.

what this "special regulation" does is open the door for future limiting of the beaches to the area residents, and also a ban of it in the future.

i just ask, that before you completely consider a law such as this. actually take part in a group ride, with the dune buggy association folks.

another time in our nations history, regulations passed without consideration of the people that it truly affected, lead to 13 states leaving the Union. granted that probably wouldnt happen again, but it is something to think about as well. as my history professor in college once said " History never repeats itself, but it does tend to rhyme."

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13416    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Maja Moseley

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13417    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I am opposed To a permit fee to use the beaches. Driving on the beach, thru the years as gone from a transportation usage to a traditional usage. I am opposed to a vehicle limiting system within the CHNS, this would create a single point of entry and exit to beaches wiht multiple points now. I think the Nps has woefully underestimated the financial impact that that the consent decree and regulations have already had on the depressed economy in this area. Many bussinesses can't take much more loss of income. I don't think it is fair that NPS and beach users should be forced to knuckle under to the frivolous lawsuits of the Defenders of Wildlife and the Audubon Society and the Consent Decree from a somewhat questionable Federal Judge. Currently there are far to many seasonal closing than is really needed, much of the data used is way out of line. For 25 yrs. I was the director of the 4-Plus Surf Fishing Tournament Held every spring, every yr. I got a permit for the Tourn. and every yr. I received a set of regulations for the Beachs, this always seemed somewhat like a management plan for a constantly changing area. I also think that the average beach user cares far more for Nature and the seashore than anyone gives them credit for. Robert E. Barritt, jr. of Henrico, Va.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13418    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

The proposed changes for ORV access to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area are not in the best interest of the people for whom the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area was created for. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is for the people to recreate. This includes driving, swimming , fishing, walking, hunting, commercial fishing and relaxing. If the people are denied access then it is no longer a Recreational Area as it was designated as by the Government. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational are is important to the people whom live around it and the visitors whom come to visit and enjoy this Recreational Area as designated by the Government. The best available science has not been used in the studies in which much of the proposed rule changes are being based on either. The economic impact was totally ignore. The heritage of the people whom depend on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore was not considered in the proposed changes. None of the proposed changes should be done to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.



---

**Correspondence ID:** 13419    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** This really scares me. I go to the beaches often and I see how these people operate the ORV's. Most of them are reckless with no regard for people and especially wildlife. Many are young kids who should not be even driving it without supervision. There are plenty of places to ride ORV's without ruining the beach for people and wildlife.

But,I guess it depends on how big and strong the ORV's lobbyists are!!! The people and wildlife will, most likely, lose again!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13420    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** i believe that the beaches should be open to pedestrian access year around. the tourism industry is a big commodity for the outer banks, most of the tourists that head to the beach are going to relax and get away from the everyday stress that any person that undergoes throughout everyday life. if the beaches are closed that outer banks wont have the beach appeal to everyone that it has now. by closing them i believe that tourism dollars will be dispersed throughout the eastern shore more and less money will be taken away from North Carolin's income.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13421    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs anddoes not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. Andit reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians andwildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beachdriving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use nearprotected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on theshore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to153. If wildlife is not explicitlyprotected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into anarea that is not protected, and it could be run over.

Please protect the lives and futire lives of these innocent animals. After all, they were here first.

I come to the beach to see the wildlife, If you allow it to disappear I will no longer go.

Sincerely, Pam Abirached

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13422    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** OFF ROAD VEHICLES IN PARKS AND OTHER RECREATIONS ARE ALWAYS DANGEROUS.

I see small children on these vehicles and adults not always in control of themselves.

ROSE WATKINS / ONE WOMAN WALKING RECYCLING SINCE 2004

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13423    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It is unbelievable and inconceivable to destroy Wildlife in this way.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13424    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** There are plenty of places where people who want to drive around can do so. Places where the environment is already damaged by the noise, pollution and destructive force of tires. Please don't destroy yet another. After all, those of use who wish to enjoy nature in relative peace also have rights

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13425    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The NPS in general and Cape Hatteras National Seashore were established for the purpose of HUMAN recreation. Off road driving has long been a way to support the tradition of using the Cape Hatteras National Seashore for Human recreation, it should be allowed to continue in as much of the park as possible. Section (c) (2) of the proposed rule mentions permits. If permits are required, they should be nominally priced (or free) and easily obtainable via internet, retail shops as well as directly from the park service. Section (d) (9) Designated Routes. It is sadly disturbing to see that some of the areas we have traditionally used not only for fishing, but also for surfing, windsurfing, kitesurfing and just hanging out will no longer be accessible. Please reconsider the VFA limitations of the rule and permit vehicles where they have traditionally been allowed. Specifically in all of the areas around Cape Point, including the back roads, areas along the sound, Ramps 23 to Avon Pier and Ramp 55 to the Coast Guard Station and all the roads in between. Vehicle access assists us in transporting our fishing and water sports equipment. These activities keep us fit and active and allow us to recreate so we can be productive members of society. If you must limit vehicle use, then please allow for very convenient parking to these areas that have been traditionally accessible by vehicle. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13426    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Nature lives without humans - but humans can't live without nature!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13427    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13428    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As a life long resident of North Carolina and an avid outdoors person, I am thankful for the opportunity to submit my comments on both the proposed management document and the process by which it was achieved.

After participating in the process for 20 years, I am not the least bit hopeful that my comments, nor those of anyone else, will have any impact on the agenda of the NPS. I am a simple citizen. I only represent one vote. My experience with this process, as handled by NPS, has led me to the conclusion that the "fix is in", the minds of those in control are set and that nothing the citizens say or do will prevent the present disastrous plan from being implemented.

This conclusion was not reached quickly nor without a great deal of thought and angst. My current mindset has been formed by participation in the process, watching the Reg-Neg debacle, the court cases, the agenda driven and totally inept NPS representatives, the arbitrary, unsupportable 'science' used, the total disregard for the intent of the original enabling legislation and the total disregard for the impacts of the proposed rule on the residents, the park's users and the true lovers of the Cape Hatteras National Recreation Area.

The rule under current consideration is the poorest ever developed in my decades of involvement. It is without merit in any way mostly because it is a 'solution' in search of a reason to exist. It's consequences, both intended and unintended will be disastrous for the residents and the park's users, undermine any possible support for the NPS, fail to accomplish the intended benefit for wildlife on the island and cost the citizens much money and inconvenience.

I strongly recommend that this rule be totally abandoned and the process begun, once again, with a different mindset, one that is less fearful of lawsuits, one that uses peer reviewed science, one that is supportable nationwide, one that considers the fact that without the public's support, it will not succeed.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13429    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Shocking. Barbaric. Third world.

In Britain, as in other civilised countries, motor vehicles are prohibited from all beaches, except occasionally for tractors for launching small boats, and official beach cleaning vehicles.

The NPS should do likewise.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13430    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As an American committed to protecting the Earth, I urge the Park Service to strengthen it's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Please fulfill your mandate and protect the seashores for future generations of people and wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13431    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Wildlife protection on our planet should not be considered an optional activity. More than just bird watching depends on the survival of all species of an ecosystem. Ultimately life on this planet ( including yours and your grandchildren's) depends on an ecosystem remaining intact.

Please provide adequate scientifically based protection for the shore birds on Cape Hatteras, As it stands now- document IDNPS-2011-0005-0001 is does not offer adequate protection. Please set the standard by providing adequate protection now.

Sincerely Julia Calderon

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13432    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Supertindant Murray:

I am concerned about the proposal to expand the use of ORVs on our beach. It is vital that we protect our wildlife These vehicles have to be destructive to our coastline in addition of harming the cycle of turtles and birds. Please help protect our nature in North Carolina.

Sincerely,

Carol Tomlinson

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13433    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

There has been such progress in protecting wildlife in Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Please don't allow it to go to waste!

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13434    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I whole-heartedly agree with limiting the access of ORVs at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Frankly, I am surprised that they are allowed there at all, but especially in environmentally sensitive areas. When someone chooses to go to a natural seashore, they expect a natural setting, not the noise and intrusion of ORVs. More important, the ORVs not only threaten areas normally set aside to help threatened species, but they churn up berms, dunes and disturb the roots of plants that help to slow the erosion of beaches and dunes. There is also no way to monitor or hold accountable individuals who choose to cause damage to the environment. The use of ORVs is, in short, unenforceable. There are few places where people can go to experience the true natural beauty of our coast. Please do not allow a few individuals to spoil this nationally treasured area with intrusive, damaging ORVs. This area should be protected as a public trust. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore is being addressed in this email, but I feel they should be banded from all National Parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13435    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13436    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and

pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13437    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13438    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Comment on proposed Rule 36 CFR Part 7 Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System. RIN 1024-AD85

I am thoroughly against any of more of my tax money wasted by the National Park System on Hatteras Island. Studies done by certain environmental groups have acknowledged that this will have an economic impact on the businesses on Hatteras Island. Now they can document the fact that business and therefore, the people, have suffered from this complete waste of our tax money.

I would like you to consider comments these same groups have said about the government rebuilding HWY 12 last week. They want to stop the rebuilding because they say it is a waste of taxpayers money to rebuild the road on an island that is washing away. So, how can they justify spending their own money on legal fees to force the National Park Service to spend our tax dollars protecting birds on an island that they have said is washing away???

There is no way to justify spending any money to protect the very few birds there and the expense of the people that live their. Hatteras Island, along with Ocracoke and surrounding uninhabited islands provide a large amount of land that people do not even go to and provide land for the birds. The amount of land used by people on Hatteras, Ocracoke and surrounding islands is very small compared to the total land size. Therefore, there is no need or any logical, intelligent reason to restrict access to any portions of the beach. Why is the only beach being restricted the areas being used by people? Why is the Park Service spending tax dollars to kill other animals to protect birds?? How is that protecting the wildlife?

DO NOT SPEND ANY OF MY TAX DOLLARS ON THIS!!! IT IS THE BIGGEST WASTE OF TAX DOLLARS.

You must consider the cost/benefit of this. The cost is great, not only our tax dollars wasted but the lost jobs and what this has done to the economy on Hatteras Island. I have yet to read any benefits.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13439    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.

I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

I oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13440    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow ORVs to operate on the beach or other sensitive areas of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. This environment provides invaluable nesting habitat for many species, and ORVs being allowed to run through this habitat would be destructive to these species.

We have had issues in Louisiana with vehicles operating on the beaches through nesting habitat. Often, vehicles would run right through tern colonies, smashing nestlings and eggs under their tires as the parents flew away in fear. This is not healthy for these birds. Such scenarios will be replicated in Cape Hatteras National Seashore if ORVs are allowed to operate within its borders. The NPS system exists to protect our natural resources for the benefit of all who are alive today, and for future generations. Please continue to protect the natural resources of our animals who live in this national seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13441    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act. To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

Thank you for considering these comments and for the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13442    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** ORV have no business being on the beach running thru nests and disturbing wildlife. They should be banned and never allowed to exist in the first place. It's ignorant to continue to manufacture something like this that is so destructive to the environment !

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13443    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13444    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use

on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13445    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13446    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13447    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13448    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13449    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13450    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13451    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13452    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13453    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Sirs



I feel it necessary to comment on behalf of the people who live and enjoy the seashore more frequently than myself.

I find this ruling to be very restrictive on the superintendent and the wording changed allow him more flexibility within the law. I will now comment on specific points in the ruling:

(c) (2) ORV Permits., While I do not support permits/fees, if they are instituted by the superintendent, he should limit their cost to a minimal amount that could be readily afforded by the average citizen. A visitor to the Delaware Seashore is cost prohibitive for non residents at a cost of \$150+. The permits should be available as a rolling 12 months and not as a calendar year such as fishing licenses. Any permit should be readily available on the internet, the educational requirement should be minimum to avoid discriminatory practices. The NPS could not possibly process the volume of visitors arriving on a sunny Saturday in mid-summer thus creating unintended closures .

(c) (7) Special use permits.... (iii) Transportation of mobility impaired individuals; We appreciate a permit being made available but to immediately remove the vehicle presents a safety issue for the impaired person. The driver must be allowed to keep the vehicle conveniently parked to allow a quick and orderly transport from the beach if the need should arise.

VFA's should not be permanently designated areas and only instituted when found necessary by the Superintendent [ie, (10) Superintendent's closures.....]. VFA's (Vehicle Free Areas, a new term being used and implemented within this Proposed Rule) will require additional off beach parking for those who chose to be pedestrians within the VFA's. If experience shows that VFA/s are not being regularly used by a justifiable number of pedestrians these VFA's could/should be reopened for ORV use.

Thank you in advance for taking the time to consider the desires of the citizens while finalizing the ruling.

Yours truly

Thomas Matherly

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13454	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	RIN 1024-AD85 Comment on proposed rule 36 cfr Part 7 special regulations, areas of the national park system. Having read the Benefit Cost Analysis of proposed ORV use regulatons in Cape Hatteras National Recreational Area, I am not suprised that the NPS has again produced a document chocked full of speculation and opinion. It is so full of might, should , could possibly ,and will most likely that it reads more like fiction than a government report. The use of data from areas North of Oregon Inlet should not be applied. Comparing the northern beaches to Hatteras Island is like compairing apples to oranges. The analysis states that the great economic impact will be felt by Small Businesses within the Villages. Then contradicts itself two paragraphs later stating there will be no negitive economic impact on small business. Like many hard working TAX PAYING people , I have had enough of this governmental agency foolishness and have no intention of standing idely by while Cape Hatteras National Recreational Area is defaced by parking lots. Return the park to the INTERIM MANAGEMENT STRATEGY that provided both reasonable access and protection for wildlife. Fred Kinzel Currituck N.C.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13455	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.						

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13456	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** My wish is for strong protection for wild life and for persons enjoying this special place in as non-invasive way as possible. I have enjoyed this wonderful area in the past and hope to again. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13457    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am extremely concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13458    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Ann

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13459    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** In regard to the proposed rules for Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I find many are unfair and unrealistic. For instance:

1. Permanent closures of major surf fishing spots with no compromise accommodation for ORVs whatsoever—come on leave some access
2. Completely closing ramp 34 a major access for many Avon residents
3. Establishing a new bureaucracy to handle proposed fees. They are advertising to hire six personnel to handle fees and indoctrination and inspections when registration could be done by internet. The indoctrination could then be handled by less personnel and spaced out so the registrant might have 4 or 5 days in which to handle it, get inspected, see a movie or whatever
4. The rumored fee of \$100-\$150 is oppressively high and will further limit people driving on the beach which is apparently an objective.
5. Vacationers all of whom have a limited time frame will be unfairly penalized by onerous queues to obtain permits (many will go elsewhere which will further effect the economic pressures on local businesses)
6. Many fishermen in the past have driven all night to arrive for a weekend of fishing starting on arrival. Your proposed rules will effectively diminish their numbers (again it seems that is the objective)
7. Paying lip service by keeping Cape Point reasonably accessible is the only fair compromise that I can find in the entire proposal

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13460    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** buracracy at it's finest thanks to environmentalist that don't want anyone but birds on the island. makes me sick to see this... i am sure my children's children will not be coming to Cape Hatteras because it will be forbidden. congratulations for making simple complicated. shame on everyone.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13461    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13462    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect endangered birds!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13463    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Help save birds and wilderness.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13464    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13465    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13466    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please consider restricting off road vehicles in the Cape Hatteras area. There is absolutely no reason that people need unrestricted use of this area when it CLEARLY endangers wildlife and wild habitat. There must be a sensible solution/compromise to this issue, and I firmly believe it is worth your time to find it. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13467    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Protecting Cape Hatteras is vital. The birds there are dependent upon that special place for nesting and migration. We are the only ones who can protect them!! If we fail to do so, we are essentially "letting the cats" into the neighborhood. Why would any caring human do that? Please act like a truly human being and protect those who can not speak for nor protect themselves.

Sincerely, Virginia Stowe

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13468    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am commenting to oppose the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area ORV Proposed Rule (RIN 1024-AD85). I am writing as a tourist and one who spends money to vacation in Cape Hatteras or Frisco almost annually, and must state that I will be much less inclined to do so should I be required to purchase a permit to drive on/to the beaches. Accessing remote beaches to enjoy fishing, swimming, etc. is a unique attraction to the area, and the sole reason I choose to vacation there rather than Nags Head or somewhere else completely. If I am required to participate in an "education program" and pay a fee in order to acquire a permit, I honestly would elect to take my money elsewhere. Also, when I do vacation in Hatteras, I bring my extended family - usually 4 or 5 families in all. That is a lot of money that will not be spent in and around Cape Hatteras.

I disagree with the principle of the permit for a number of reasons. The permitting fee is discouraging, and is unnecessary if the money is not spent by the government to regulate the situation unnecessarily. The educational program is also unnecessary, as it is nothing that cannot be conveyed by posting a sign at the access points.

The overwhelming majority of those who uses the driving access on the beaches wants to protect the island and everything on it. Those that believe preventing driving on the beaches ruins the natural state of the island are ignorant. The goals of the proposed regulations can and are achieved by the people that currently use the driving privileges by self-policing. Everyone is more than willing to offer help and guidance for those that may be ignorantly doing something wrong (a very rare occurrence). Responsible people are also more than willing to report any offenders that do not respond to being told they are doing something wrong (an even more rare occurrence).

Please do the right thing in the American spirit and do not over-govern a situation that does not require it

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13469    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please give the following consideration during finalization of this Rule Making. Limit buffers for nesting areas. 1000 meters is excessive and provide for passage for pedestrians and orv so they can conveniently get to areas not being utilized for nesting. Limit permitting to extent possible. Minimum cost and convenient to obtain, preferably via internet. Proposed method would place undue hardship on many visitors. Some proposed Ramp alteration and addition seems unnecessary and expensive. Please reconsider. More consideration should be given to the elderly and physically impaired. Keep in mind that the Birds and turtles are adaptable and there are many ways to share the beach with them. This seems to be completely overlooked.

Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13470    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the proposed rule changes and here is why. A study of history reveals the importance of including the words "Recreational Area" today.

June 29, 1940, Congress amends the enabling legislation and the words "Recreational Area" are added to further emphasize the recreational nature of the seashore as a destination for beach goers and fishermen.

On May 10, 1954, the National Park Service gave administrative permission for the staff to use the shorter name "Cape Hatteras National Seashore" in all but the most formal memoranda and legal documents in place of the more cumbersome "Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area." This administrative short cut created a nickname, but never changed the official name.

At the official dedication ceremony on April 24, 1958, representatives of both the Department of Interior and the National Park Service repeatedly referred to it as the "Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area."

Although the full name with the words "Recreational Area" subsequently fell from use by the Department of Interior and the National Park Service, it was never officially changed by Congress.

Even on this site where I'm making my comment NPS is still refusing to acknowledge the Recreational Area. Recreational Area MUST be used since this is what it is.

The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area is just that. To deny any access to the beaches is a violation of what Congress set for The Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13471    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

OUR NATIONAL PARKS MUST BE PROTECTED. First priority is the park land itself. Second priority is the wildlife. Third priority is allowing people to take advantage of pristine parks in a non threatening or destructive manor. ORV's will violate all three of those priorities.

It was my understanding that it unlawful to pick plants or gather rocks or relics in a National Park. How on earth can you justify the use of ORV's???

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13472    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** To protect wildlife and our environment from frivolous human actions should be the job of our government. I urge you to do your job by approving document NPS-2011-0005-0001, Special Regulations, Areas of National Park System: Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Not to do so would generate deterioration and likely eventual destruction of this habitat, as we know it. As a result, future generations of ours will never know it, and wildlife there would cease to exist. For what? Are we expected to value ORVs rather than endangered shorebirds and turtles? Is that to be our legacy for our grandchildren? I certainly hope not!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13473    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13474    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations.

For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

Thank you for considering these comments and for the hard work of the NPS.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13475    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed.

I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13476    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13477    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13478    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras was created so that the common working man would have a beach they could go to and enjoy. Created so this enjoyment would not be burdened with the high cost associated with private beach.

Under the rules of the consent decree I have seen my yearly beach trips go from four (4) per year to none (0) in the last 22 months. Unfortunately this situation not only hurts me as this is my favorite place to vacation but it also is extremely negatively impactful to the businesses I no longer frequent and spend my money at.

Adding a high dollar permit to drive on the beaches is an extremely bad idea that will further choke off the communities. On top of that this permit will create a new level of bureaucracy that will grow bigger and serve no positive purpose. You don't need these people now so why add them? Bureaucrats wasting money providing a service that hasn't been needed or necessary. This makes no sense.

The proposed continuation of the night driving bans again makes me far less likely to use the park. Historically there has never been an issue with turtles. That is until a turtle loving judge stepped in and shut night driving down. Flooding and predation are the biggest problems turtles face. Not headlights on the beach. Again, doesn't make sense.

Please return the park to like it was prior to the consent decree. Meet the letter of the law however do it with no additional restrictions. I want to use my beach as I see best. If I want to be in a crowd I can. If I want to be off to myself I can. By further limiting access and adding time restrictions that is less and less and option.

Free and open access as was promised when the people gave up their land to help the park get established. The park was one of the best places ever. Please use common sense and return it back. By not doing so the proposed new rules will kill off the communities. If you are trying to run me off, it has worked. Very sad and very upsetting.

Rick Rowe

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13479    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I find it troubling that some of the proposed actions in this document will cost a lot of money. Money that the NPS does not have and it is questionable as to when it will get the funding necessary to implement these actions. on top of that, some of them seem unnecessary to start with. At the same time, other actions will hurt the ability of local businesses to survive. This does not make sense. Activity and use on CHNSRA is not "Broken". Policy and regulation does not need a complete overhaul. Just a little tweaking will do. I also found it troubling that with reference to the "Benefit-Cost Analysis of Proposed ORV Use Regulations" DOI certified that this document will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities. Then I see a figure of 100,000,000 dollars being used. With the run-a-way spending and businesses laying off and going under, this is to me, very disturbing. Thank You

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13480    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Myself and my husband have been frequent (several times a year) visitors to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore for the last 30 years. We live within a few hours and some years we have visited there to fish and enjoy the beaches, as often as 3 or 4 times a month in the prime fishing season, and also even in the off season. We LOVE the beaches at Hatteras. We especially enjoy going to "the point" for fishing, walking the beach, sunbathing, swimming, relaxing, etc. I am very upset with all the going on and the proposed increased limited access for many reasons. This area was designated as a recreational park. The fact that the powers that be can so easily change that is very disheartening to me, and makes me loose more faith in our government. I love wildlife, and that is part of what I love about the Hatteras beaches. I can honestly say that in all the 30 years I have been going there I have not witnessed anyone disturbing the wildlife, and on the contrary, I have seen people go out of their way to make sure it was not disturbed. I am sure there are some folks that would disagree with me, but I am writing about what I have personally seen myself. I see people pcking up their trash, and for the most part being considerate to one another. Again, I love wildlife and I saw nothing wrong with the way the humans and the birds were cohabitating for the 30 years I have been going there. What does upset me is that now, the birds actually have more rights than our children who are abused...or someone who is found in violation of the new rules is more strictly penalized than a child abuser in some cases. Something is wrong with this picture. Also in the last 11 years have become disabled, and am not able to walk long distances, on inclines, uneven, etc. I had a lung transplant and get out of breath easily. The wonderful thing about Hatteras beaches is we can drive right to our fishing spot and I can get out and fish or enjoy the day. I cannot walk from parking lot beach.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13481    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** We live in a tourist area that is driven by tourists. When they come on vacation, they come for 2 main reasons: 1 to relax and 2 to have fun. Both of these intermingle with each other. Some of these activities involve Going to the beach, fishing, eating out, shopping. If beaches keep closing, People will not be able to relax nor have fun on the beach. With that in mind, those people will go elsewhere and take their money with them. This is a ripple effect as with less money in the economy, less people will be eating at restaurants, shopping at stores, fishing and less playing. After the hurricane, The economy here is in a fragile situation. All businesses do not need another factor to add to this effect as it could devastate them.

**Correspondence ID:** 13482    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I do understand the reasons for an ORV management plan at the CHNS as dictated by previous agreements/rulings. I believe that the cost and a potentially poor implementation will drive tourism away from the area in question. I hope that the NPS considers carefully the process of issuing permits and providing the proposed education. I believe there will be mayhem during peak tourist season if this is not thoroughly thought out. I would hope that Internet application/education would be a viable form of getting this accomplished. For me, I need beach access via ORV due to physical limitations, though I am not handicapped. Without ORV access "made simple", I would probably be taking my family vacations elsewhere. I imagine that there are many others who will do the same. Thank you.

**Correspondence ID:** 13483    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As someone who has vacationed in the area, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration. Meredith D. Priestley

**Correspondence ID:** 13484    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I am opposed to the proposed CHNAS regulations as they are weighed so heavily in favor the Audubon Society that they may well have written them. Where is the fairness and objectivity in these rules? Why does chnas propose 1000 meters around a plover nest when both Cape Cod and Assateague get by with much less? What is the practicality of their night driving rules? Why now do they propose an hour earlier closing than that currently in place? Where is the science behind these proposals? How did OMB approve without questioning the economic reasoning which was based on a flawed and discredited old study as well as a current one which has deficiencies also?

I do not understand how a rule predicating many physical and geographical changes can be put into effect when those changes are non existant and are somewhat unlikely to ever happen in view of the current economic situation!

Specifically I refer to a couple of new ramps, parking places for pedestrians, new roads away from the ocean between some ramps. They are currently not in place and in my view are doubtful in the near future.

In my 88 years of life I have never before witnessed such a politically motivated government steamroller. It is extremely frustrating! Although I believe my coments can be defended in fact,I AS WELL AS MANY OTHERS VIEW THIS AS AN EXERCISE IN FUTILITY. We believe the comment period is not for reasonable feedback but is here to comply with requirements of the law.



---

**Correspondence ID:** 13485    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Public Comment - Final ORV Plan, (RIN) 1024-AD85, Submitted By Alan, September 6, 2011 Part 1 of 8

Background: My first trip to CHNSRA was with my parents in 1972, as we frequently visited the Duck, NC portion of the OBX and would make day-trips to CHNSRA just about yearly. After becoming an adult, I put the northern OBX behind me and became a regular visitor to CHNSRA in the early 1980's. After repeatedly visiting throughout the 1980's, our family decided to get a place in Frisco in 1993, and we've been there ever since. However, our family's future on Hatteras Island is now in question. Many of the rules put forward in the Final Plan are vague and questionable enough for us to wonder if it will be worth the effort to get permits and educational requirements to only then be told that the beaches have reached "carrying capacity", and to be turned away, or to have so many overlapping closure seasons as to not have ORV or pedestrian access to our favorite spots during our time of visitation. A nearly 20-year run of spending 40+ days yearly in CHNSRA may be coming to an abrupt and unwanted end, which is something that is heart-breaking to all in my family. This also does not include quite a few extended friends and family who have vowed to never return once the plan is in place. I participated in the Negotiated Rulemaking process as a stakeholder from the very beginning, attended a few meetings, and put forth both written and oral public comments. I have seen where the vast majority of the public comments submitted during this process have supported less intrusive alternatives to the selected Alternative F, only to be summarily ignored by the NPS/DOI. I have very little hope that this comment, which is to be my last on the matter, will have any impact on the Final Rule at all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13486    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The Coastal Conservation Association North Carolina submits these comments on the National Park Service's (NPS) proposed Off Road Vehicle (ORV) rules for Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area (CHNSRA). As a general comment the NPS has proposed in its Final Environmental Impact statement and in these subsequent rules, significant restrictions on both citizen and ORV usage of the CHNSRA which was established specifically as a recreation area for the enjoyment of visitors. Yet, the NPS has proposed rules that restrict the very usage of the CHNSRA. The creation of excessive "buffer zones", "Vehicle Free Areas", and areas closed to all visitors are all contrary to the enjoyment of the general public. These rules are also inconsistent with other national parks and seashores as well as traditional uses of CHNSRA. Assumptions published in the Federal Record as preamble to the ORV rules indicate conflicts among users, harassment of wildlife and conflicts with "wise use" of the CHNSRA, yet these are either non-existent or minimal. The FEIS and proposed ORV Rules seem to be an impetuous reaction to a lawsuit filed by a small group of environmentalist who have misrepresented the effect of ORV use within CHNSRA. The assumptions do not reflect the opinion of the overwhelming majority of historical users of CHNSRA.

The proposed rule for ORV use imposes significant restrictions well beyond traditional use of the park and will require ORV users to buy a permit (at what cost?), receive "a short education program", and impose restrictions on the type of equipment required to operate in the park. CCA NC believes it is grossly unfair to single out one user group for these types of restrictions. No other users are subject to such requirements.

The rule does not stipulate the cost of a permit, how it will be issued, what the "short education program" will consist of, who will administer the education, how the "signed document" will be processed and by whom. This level of bureaucracy will be costly, unnecessary, and a nightmare for ORV users of CHNSRA. The rule makes no provision for obtaining a permit over the phone or internet as it stipulates the person must complete the "short education program" and sign in person. Given the number of visitors to CHNSRA during peak periods, this could be a horrific problem. Permits must be affordable and easily acquired by phone or the internet on a 24 hour, 365 day basis. The education program must be available electronically as well. These strategies would lessen the time required or the need to appear in-person to attain a permit.

The rule states that there will be no limit to the number of "permits" issued to ORV users. However, the rule states that the superintendent may "temporarily limit, restrict or terminate access to (ORV) routes". The reasons for such termination were given as "resource protection, carrying capacity, and other management activities and objectives?" Given the popularity of certain locations, i.e. Cape Point, Hatteras Inlet, Oregon Inlet and Ocracoke Inlet, during specific times of the year, the impact on ORV users and fishermen would be very dramatic and result in significant confrontations in the park.

The rule establishes "Vehicle Free Areas" (VFA) within the CHNSRA. The criteria used to identify and determine VFAs is not defined or explained. These criteria must be clearly defined so future changes, extensions, or eliminations of VFAs are clearly understood. There is very limited evidence that there is a true need for VFAs. The majority of pedestrian users remain very close to the ramp or parking area from which they gained access while ORV users typically spread out along the beach. VFAs may have the unintended consequences of concentrating users in small areas. This has phenomenon already been observed when access has been limited by "resource closures". The NPS clearly has the potential of creating a problem in these areas when none currently exists. The VFAs will probably increase the need for additional parking areas in the park. Who will pay for the establishment of these parking areas and access routes? How quickly can areas be constructed? Will the pedestrians using these areas be required to obtain a permit to pay for these parking areas and their enforcement? NPS needs to proactively address these needs, construct sites, and have future funding sources identified prior to implantation of VFAs. No VFAs should be designated as permanent; all VFAs should be reviewed on a regular basis and the VFA designation removed if pedestrian use does not justify the existence of the VFA.

The rule suggests establishment of new ORV access ramps. CA NC applauds this action to increase public access to CHNSRA. The new ramps could mitigate some of the effects of beach closures that may occur. However, budget constraints are likely to impede construction of additional ramps. CCA NC suggests establishing a separate and specific fund to pay for the construction of these ramps. The funding could come from permit fees and donations from NGOs. CCA NC insists that no access be eliminated until all new proposed ramps are completed.

The restrictions on night driving are clearly unnecessary. The only identified turtle fatality caused by an ORV in the last 30 years occurred under the current night driving restrictions. A more commonsense approach is to require all ORVs to use regular driving lights during low light situations. This approach will reduce the impact on nighttime users. The nighttime restrictions are arbitrary and not based upon science or research.

CCA NC is very concerned that sufficient funding exists to implement the current proposals without substantially reducing the other areas of CHNSRA NPS activities.

Many of these rules are unnecessary and will continue to limit the access to CHNSRA rather than improve the public's ability to enjoy this magnificent recreation area! One has to ask what was the intent of Congress when CHNSRA was established?

In conclusion, CCA NC is very disappointed that the very people for whom Congress established the CHNSRA are being treated so poorly by our National Park Service. Instead of developing rules that provide maximum access for the vast majority of CHNSRA users, the NPS continues to degrade the opportunity for use. While the economic impact of these rules may not be \$100 million per year on the outer banks economy, the cultural, traditional and recreational loss due to these rules is enormous.

Sincerely,

Jim Hardin, President Coastal Conservation Association North Carolina

Copy to: The Honorable Richard Burr United States Senate Washington, DC 20510 The Honorable Kay R. Hagan United States Senate Washington, DC 20510 The Honorable Walter B. Jones, Jr. House of Representatives Washington, DC 20515 Mr. David Vela, Regional Director National Park Service 100 Alabama Street, SW 1924 Building Atlanta, GA 30303

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13487	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	• NOTICE: I POSTED THIS EARLIER BUT DIDN'T SEE A CONFIRMATION. THIS IS NOT AN INTENTIONAL DUPLICATION. PLEASE DISREGARD IF IT IS						

I am opposed to the proposed regulations at Cape Hatteras because they are extremely biased against the ORV users. It is apparent to me that the Department of the interior has taken a strong position in favor of the Audubon Societies' position and the result is a political rather than scientifically based decision. The interim plan would be fine if it were tweaked, but the current proposal started with the basis of the court order and tripled the restrictions from there.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13488	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13489    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13490    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Public Comment - Final ORV Plan, (RIN) 1024-AD85, Submitted By Alan, September 6, 2011 Part 2 of 8 1. VFA's:

a. Locations The locations set forth in the ROD, hereafter referred to as "The Final Plan", are currently some of the most inaccessible and inhospitable areas of the seashore recreation area with regards to pedestrian access, which they are supposedly set aside for.

b. Access The VFA's to be located at South Beach and Hatteras Inlet Point would require a hike of such proportions as to be prohibitive to most visitors, particularly those with either very young or very old family members during the peak summer months. Their very location with respect to parking areas and other amenities such as bathrooms and running water will assuredly deny pedestrians access to these areas that are supposed to be set up for their private use, rendering the designation of these areas worthless.

c. VFA's Closed to ORV's Year-Round VFA's should be managed in the same manner as seasonal village closures, as there is no benefit for having vast tracts of beach closed during the winter months. Over-wintering closures and pre-nesting closures combined should suffice for resource protection, and there is no justifiable reason for these areas to be ORV-free in the months where all user group visitation is historically low. This scenario seems highly punitive to year-round residents who wish to traverse seashore's beach in the off-season, in particular the South Beach area.

d. Unintended and Detrimental Consequences As has been demonstrated by the presence over-wintering closures coupled with pre-nesting/nesting/fledging closures at Cape Point/South Beach since the inception of the Consent Decree in 2008, the absence of ORV's leads to uninhibited plant growth from the dunes up to the mean high tide line, thus giving predators more habitat in which to wreak havoc and even death upon the very bird and turtle species that the NPS wishes to protect.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13491    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13492    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Why are you involved in something that is none of your business?

I have been vacationing to this part of the country for almost thirty years. Never has there been a problem with ORV.

The locals had no problem. The vacationers had no problem. In fact, vacationers choose this area precisely because there is the opportunity to off-shore drive.

And the beaches are always, ALWAYS left clean for the next visitors.

It's time the federal government backed off. We don't need you to regulate our lives.

With all due respect, go away.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13493    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please save the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13494    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very opposed to the ORV proposed rule RIN1024-AD85. I am long time visitor as well as a land owner on "CAPE HATTERA NATIONAL SEA SHORE" As it's name implies the sea shore was designated for use by the people who come to the NATIONAL SEA SHORE for recreational purposes. I find it very offensive that this bill is even being considered. The people and business of Hatteras Island will dwindle and then fade away because of lack of tourism because people who cant get to the beaches by ORV's will no longer visit the Outer Banks. ORV is one the big draws on Hatteras Island. I also oppose the idea of a fee for ORV, in this economy who is going to be able to afford this fee? Again you will be pushing pople away from the Outer Banks by this ruling. I happen to be a handicapped person. If the ORV roads are closed I will not be able to get over the dunes to see the beauty and unigness of the soul filling beauty of the ocean that can only be found on the Outer Banks. I also oppose the ban on night driving on the beach. For the past 20 years (no, the last 2 years we were not permitted night driving) of sharing quality time with my family while fishing and having a campfire at night on the beach. I watched my children grow year by year as we spent two to three weeks on the Outer Banks every year. Time without all the business that traps us in our everyday life. Going to the Outer Banks is like going back in time. The bankers have always recovered from storms, u boats, black outs and anything else that came their way. They always used the sand above the high tide or low tide marks to get them up and down the banks. Who should have the right to change something that has gone on for more than a generation? I bet they even kept the access roads in a lot better shape than the park service has done. There is no ramp open in the last 3 years or so that is easily passable, especially when one is coming in and one trying to go out. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13495    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing off-road vehicle (ORV) use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

"In permitting the sacrifice of anything that would be of the slightest value to future visitors to the convenience, bad taste, playfulness, carelessness, or wanton destructiveness of present visitors, we probably yield in each case the interest of uncounted millions to the selfishness of a few individuals." -- Frederick Law Olmstead

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the National Park Service (NPS) has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

"It is horrifying that we have to fight our own government to save the environment." -- Ansel Adams

However, the NPS has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the NPS falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the NPS must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

"From whom are the resources of the parks locked up? From the rape, ravish and run exploiter that would disrupt and destroy the biotic communities of life'yes. From the scientist, the photographer and those who would visit in harmony with the web of life of which we are all a part'no." -- Former NPS Director George Hartzog, Battling for the National Parks.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

"Every man who appreciates the majesty and beauty of the wilderness and of wild life, should strike hands with the farsighted men who wish to preserve our material resources, in the effort to keep our forests and our game beasts, game-birds, and game-fish'indeed, all the living creatures of prairie and woodland and seashore'from wanton destruction. Above all, we should realize that the effort toward this end is essentially a democratic movement." -- Theodore Roosevelt

Thank you for considering these comments and for the hard work and dedication of the NPS in preserving America's natural and cultural heritage for future generations. Please do NOT add my name to your mailing list. I will learn about future developments on this issue from other sources.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13496	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Public Comment - Final ORV Plan, (RIN) 1024-AD85, Submitted By Alan, September 6, 2011 Part 3 of 8						

2. Permits/Educational Component:

a. Unknown Permit Costs Nowhere in the The Final Plan have the costs of any permits been discussed, of even a perceived range given. How can the public realistically comment on an issue involving what could possibly be hundreds of dollars when even the approximate cost range of said permits are never disclosed?

b. Permit Availability Restrictions Forcing the visiting public to appear in person at an NPS district office on the Outer Banks is both offensive and ridiculous. The sheer volume of visitors who will wish to obtain the education course and permit will overwhelm the NPS offices during peak season, thus creating animosity toward the NPS and their policies, all while creating a negative visitor experience. To put this in perspective, in Virginia one can obtain a recently mandated Boater's Operator License education and test on-line, and then present proper identification and a personal code in person at the Game and Inland Fisheries Office to obtain the physical permit. Why the NPS cannot operate the ORV permitting system as such is beyond comprehension.

c. Multiple Vehicle Exclusion Attaching the permit to a particular vehicle, instead of to a specific driver who has passed the educational requirement of the permitting system is particularly dubious, since anyone possessing a current drivers license could operate a permitted vehicle on the beach without knowing the "rules of the road". Also, for a family living within the boundaries of the seashore with multiple vehicles, getting permits for more than one vehicle could prove financially impossible. Permits should be assigned to a particular driver who has passed the NPS course. Permits could simply be number bearing placards hung from the rear-view mirror, which would also allow a family to transfer said permit to another vehicle in their possession.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13497	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	ORV Proposed Rule (RIN 1024-AD85), National Park Service at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.						

Comments for ROV (36 CFR Part 7 - Special Regulations, Areas of NPS, paragraph 7.58:

(c) (2) ORV permits: I have no objection to permits, but disagree with collecting a fee from visitors. This is a National Park and should be accessible to all visitors without hindrance of fee. Permits should be easily attainable; eg, electronically. Additionally, the permit could be bundled with salt and fresh water fishing licenses.

(c) (7) Special permitting should be available for handicapped individuals to provide safe ORV transportation while accessing

the beach.

(c) (9) ORV routes: Allow Park Superintendent flexibility of keeping all ramps open to prevent clustering of vehicles during peak season. I have been visiting Cape Hatteras Seashore for 40 years and have seen respectful co-existence of visitor (ORV and foot traffic) with plant/animal life. Reasonal buffers were established and visitors were respectful of those boundaries. The extermination of natural predators within this park environment should not be occurring. Please don't punish the community and the local NPS for the actions of a few misinformed people. This community cares deeply for their ancestral seashore and the residents have always been the original protectors of the island's plant and animal life.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13498    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I have vacationed on the Outerbanks and specifically Hatteras and Ocracoke for close to 20 years. It is a naturalist paradise and vital to so many species. Hatteras is a treasure for the nation and a crucial link in the environmental system of North America. Almost no where else on the eastern seacoast can nature thrive and be relatively protected from humans.

These rules protecting the birds and turtles do not harm the local economy or impose a burden. If anything, the rich nature of the hatteras parks is an ecotourism feature. Kitty Hawk kites and others regularly run eco tours of the wetlands. Visitors to Ocracoke, in light of the emergency closure of the island for Irene, regularly spoke of missing the pristine environment of the island. The natural beauty of Hatteras national seashore is what brings tourists and tourists dollars there year after year.

Those who bemoan the loss of land for there 4x4s represent but a small fraction of tourist dollars. Tourists who come down with 4x4 trucks have plenty of beach front. Even during the season when there is a lot of bird protected beaches, the beaches open to 4x4 are rarely crowded.

This is a win win situation. Protecting birds and turtles protects the environment. It also promotes most of the reason tourists come to the hatteras seashore. The minority 4x4 trucks who complain, still have plenty of beach to access.

The hatteras park is a national treasure. Please keep it that way, dedicated to its unique environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13499    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it May Concern:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed rule for Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. I am a Property Owner on Hatteras Island and have been coming to Hatteras for recreation for over 20 years. I plan to one day make it my permanent home. I am in favor of Free and Open Beach Access, a right that was promised to the residents and visitors to Hatteras many years ago. I feel that the proposed rule for ORV use and access on Hatteras Beaches is far too restrictive. I am in favor of more reasonable access as well as protecting the endangered species of Hatteras. 1,000 Meter Buffers for Piping Plovers and any other bird of concern is excessive and defys common sense and proven science. I spent many hours commenting before when we were given the opportunity during failed Negotiated Rulemaking. I feel that the tens of thousands of comments that NPS received in favor of reasonable access has fallen upon deaf ears. I can not, and will not, ever understand how the NPS and the Federal Government can place a higher value on a bird or birds than the rights of Human Beings to have Free and Open Access to these beaches, not to mention adding to the demise of an already crippled Island Economy I respectfully request that you make the necessary modifications to Alternative F by going back to the buffers and guidelines as established in the Interim Strategy. Sincerely, David Dunivan

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13500    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** There is never any valid excuse to engage in activities that threaten our wildlife - endangered or otherwise. PLEASE desist!!! Turtles are crucial to our ecosystem and so vulnerable; they need all the assistance we can give them; and not only the turtles - all of the shoreline wildlife. PLEASE, this is a critical issue. Many thanks!!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13501    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** d. Exclusion of User Group by Income Level Since Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area was set forth to be just that, a Recreation Area for the non-affluent American Public, placing a high dollar value on either version of the permits will perform exclude the very class of people this Recreation Area was set up for.

Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes had this to say about this Recreation Area in 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."

It would appear that this original mission statement has either been simply forgotten, or intentionally ignored by the NPS/DOI as far as the ORV user group is concerned.

The park visitor who rents a \$2000/week oceanfront home will not be affected by ORV permitting as their access, if pedestrian in nature, will come at no charge. However, for the "Weekend Warriors" that cannot afford such high-priced rentals, who instead stays in a non-oceanfront rental or campground and wishes only to "live like a king" for their stay, will be charged dearly for their access if it is by ORV.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13502	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan. However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation. Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Thank you for considering these comments						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13503	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Public Comment - Final ORV Plan, (RIN) 1024-AD85, Submitted By Alan, September 6, 2011 Part 5 of 8						

e. Exclusion by User Group Type If the NPS was truly interested in procuring "Recovery Costs" for proposed projects within the seashore recreation area, it would seem prudent to install a toll booth at all seashore entrances.( not unlike the one currently in place on the NPS portion of the Blue Ridge Parkway in Virginia), and charge all non-resident/non-business travelers a set fee for entering the park premises. In this way, all user groups would pay into the fund used for park improvements, instead of unfairly placing the monetary burden on the backs of only one user group, which frankly seems punitive in nature. In short, to be fair and equitable, all user groups should pay to use the resource.

f. Exclusion of Pedestrians/Non-ORV User Groups from Educational Component Requirement The nearly weekly "Cape Hatteras National Seashore Beach Access Report" supplied by the CHNSRA staff clearly show that the overwhelming majority of resource closure violations are committed by pedestrians, yet there is no NPS-supplied educational component for this or any other non-orv user group. NPS-cited studies in both the DEIS and FEIS repeatedly show that nesting shorebirds birds, AMOY in particular, are more readily disturbed by humans on foot than by ORV's, yet the seashore's most documented closure violators are not required to take part in being educated. Once again, the ORV user group has been unfairly singled out , when the NPS' own data shows that other all other user groups would likely benefit from being educated about the nature of resource closures as well.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13504	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Public Comment - Final ORV Plan, (RIN) 1024-AD85, Submitted By Alan, September 6, 2011 Part 6 of 8 3. Economic Impacts The fact that the public comment period ended well before the entire economic impact statement was presented to the public by the NPS is particularly disturbing, and should have been cause for extending the comment period, but this was not the case.						

Also, to include the economic data from areas of Dare County north of the Bonner Bridge artificially skews the numbers for the contiguous Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands in an upward fashion, thus wrongly asserting that the economic impacts to these geographically separate areas are not as bad as reality has shown them to be.

4. Proposed Additional Ramps, Interdunal Routes, and Parking: a. Lack of a Timeline for "Improvements" No timeline for the proposed improvements listed above have been presented anywhere in the Final Plan by the NPS. While closures and ORV rules detrimental to the visitor experience of that user group will certainly take effect immediately after the plan is implemented, the NPS is blatantly unwilling to discuss when the proposed plans will be implement, where they will be implemented first. Once again, the ORV user group alone will have to wait for an indeterminate amount of time until their visitor experience is enhanced, while all other non-ORV user groups and various stakeholder groups will have their enhancements from day one. b. Monetary Viability of "Improvements" Due to the fact that the NPS/DOI had to abandon uncompleted restoration efforts to the Bodie Island Lighthouse earlier this year due to financial constraints, it is highly likely that the NPS will encounter the same issues with respect to adding ramps, interdunal roads and parking areas. In short, the NPS could possibly never create any of the enhancements proposed in the final plan due to lack of funding, finding themselves in breach of their own contract with the American public.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13505    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13506    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Public Comment - Final ORV Plan, (RIN) 1024-AD85, Submitted By Alan, September 6, 2011 Part 7 of 8

c. EIS' Required for "Improvements" Having personally gone through the ORV Final Rule Planning Process from Negotiated Rulemaking to this phase, it would be hard for myself or anyone to believe that all of the proposed enhancements will not have to go through numerous Environmental Impact Statements and studies before any ground can be broken, which could add years to the timeline for any and all proposed projects, possibly decades if the Bonner Bridge replacement debacle is any indication of things to come. d. Possible Litigation Against "Improvements" It would also not be surprising in the least to see anti-ORV stakeholder groups enter into litigation against the proposed improvements to the seashore, thus in the least adding years to the timeline, or at worst denying outright the improvements that were guaranteed to the visiting public by the NPS in the final plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13507    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I do not support increased restrictions to ORV travel on the beaches in Hatteras National Seashore. My family & I have been enjoying the beaches there for over 30 years. At no time have I witnessed excessive abuse of the by ORV's.

Increased restrictions will reduce the number of visitors and the income of the locals. How is this a benefit?

This portion of the east coast is a treasure. How will we pass the love for it to our kids & grand kids if we are not allowed to have them experience the beauty of the beach. Some of the sections are only accessible by ORV's?

I request you reconsider the proposed changes.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13508    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.



However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act. To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13509    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Public Comment - Final ORV Plan, (RIN) 1024-AD85, Submitted By Alan, September 6, 2011 Part 8 of 8

Conclusion: As stated earlier, it is my personal belief that this public comment period is an exercise in futility, as the NPS/DOI seems set on rails to implement Alternative F in the form that was presented in both the FEIS and the ROD, regardless of what any stakeholders have to say on either side of the issue. (Not to mention the fact that the "Interim Plan" was given a FONSI when it was studied.)

In my opinion, the NPS/DOI have taken the "path of least resistance" during this whole affair, which is to say that they sided with the Environmental Groups represented by the SELC much more than they did with any other user/stakeholder group.

It is my personal belief that this was done in this matter simply because the NPS has a greater fear of continued litigation from these deep-pocketed groups than it does from the nearly destitute ORV proponent organizations.

That the NPS did not stand up for the average CHNSRA visitor, (be they pedestrian or ORV users), is a travesty of justice on the grandest scale, and one that will not be soon forgotten by those who suffered through it.

While the actual economic impacts of the Final Rule will not be known until it has been implemented for some time, any loss of business and/or quality of life for island residents will be solely attributed to the actions or inactions of the NPS/DOI, and rightly so.

I hope you all sleep very well at night.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13510    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13511    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Protect the entire beach from off-road vehicles. Mandate large fines for violations. Protect our dwindling wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13512    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned that the Proposed Rule was not vetted properly. The distances for wildlife closures have no peer reviewed scientific data to support the unreasonable closure area allotted for a single piping plover nest. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore was established as a recreational area, not as a wildlife refuge. To limit access to recreation in support of unreasonable wildlife closures directly contradicts the enabling legislation of the park and denies users the cultural heritage of Hatteras Island.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13513    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13514    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13515    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I think the rules should be the same as what is in Corolla and Carova. You shouldn't have to pay to drive on the beach. If you post rules as far as what is and is not allowed, they will be followed. If by some chance, after a year or so passes and the rules aren't followed, then revisit the permit idea. There are people that like to go to the beach to fish and drive around that may not have the money to pay for a permit. When you charge for something that should be free, it makes you look like you are trying to keep out certain types of people. In this case, you are saying "Come to our beaches but if you can't pay our permit fees then you are not welcome here!"

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13516    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13517    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am glad that there is finally a proposal for Hatteras Island ORV access, but have some concerns of a few specifics. First, there should be no restrictions on night driving. For most of the year, especially in the summer and fall, the best fishing times are before or after dark. There has been no evidence that night time driving on the beach is detrimental to the environment. Secondly, seasonal changes should be based around the summer tourist season: change driving patterns at memorial day and labor day weekends which mark the beginning and end of the season. Traffic drops way off the other times of year, evident of the changes in speed limit on highway 12. Third, if new access routes (ramps) are planned, the current one should remain in place until the replacement is ready. Fourth, Cape Point, south point (hatteras inlet) and bodie island (oregon inlet) should remain open at all times. These areas are too important to the visitors of our island, and too important as fishing spots. Another suggestion would be to allow some of the local residents to police the beaches to assist the NPS rangers. This could work similarly to the USGC auxillary program. Please consider these revisions. We are all concerned with protecting the natural beauty of Hatteras Island, but we still desire the access to our traditional fishing and recreation areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13518    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I wish to comment on the Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

It seems like some people are like 2-year-olds and if they don't get everything they throw tantrums. ORVs have lots of access but they want access to everything, never mind if something else is hurt. We need to leave some space in this world for wildlife and for people who might want to take a peaceful walk on the beach without dodging motorized vehicles.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13519    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** 1.) As mandated by US law in USC Title 16, Subchapter LXIII, Section 459- any reference to Cape Hatteras National Seashore is the Federal register notice should be changed to read "Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area" as this is the name that congress mandated that the area should be known as. Only congress has the authority to change this name. By changing the name the concept of the reason for the creation of the seashore is changed.

2.) Proposal 36CFR 7.58 (c) (3) (4) Vehicle Equipment and Inspection. This provision is an open ended license for park service personnel to stop and search any vehicle at any time without suspicion or cause of wrong doing. All text concerning vehicle equipment and vehicle inspection should be deleted or revised such that it is clear that authorized persons may inspect vehicles only when suspect wrong doing or unsafe conditions.

3.) Proposal 36 CFR 7.58 (C) (9) Designated Routes The table showing designated ORV routes should be changed to show ORV routes as they were designated in the 2007 interim management plan and as they currently exist. The table and the park service analysis as designated is flawed, the table refers to ramps that do not exist and proposes to close public area without giving a reason why. The cost of the proposed new ramps has not been addressed. The NPS has not indicated when they will be built, how much time it would take, or where the money will come from to build them. Will additional environmental studies be required? What will be their estimated cost? Given the current economy, the NPS budget will probably decrease considerably in the foreseeable future. The likelihood is that the public will never see any of the proposed ramps built. The NPS should not propose to designate ORV routes for public use that do not exist.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13520    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please make some policies on motor vehicles riding on the beach that will protect the seashore and its bird population. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13521    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Services's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen hugh gains in the area. Sea turtles that ony created 82 nests in the year 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

Please, I urge you to support and enforce specific enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

I thank you for your consideration. Respectfully, (Mrs.) Susan P. Vessicchio 66 Pope Street New Haven,CT 06512 (203) 467-1532 email: susancarolpves@aol.com

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13522      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

Sincerely, John G. Combs

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13523      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Parks should be to enjoy the wildlife- not harass it, threaten or cause wildlife it to die! Off road vehicles are not suitable for a Park setting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13524      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13525    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As someone who has worked long hours monitoring endangered piping plover nesting on our Long Island beaches please do not let these birds be run over by ORV,s. We have plenty of roads in this country for vehicles, can't we allow these poor birds to survive in their only suitable environment! Perhaps if these people would get off their noisy gas guzzling OTV,s and walk on the beach they would learn something they might appreciate about their environment. Why do humans always have to have the world on their terms until we have no world at all?!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13526    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Unrestricted off road vehicle use will further threaten species that are already endangoured, such sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife. It is a wrong step to take.

I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13527    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect these beautiful and irreplaceable areas!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13528    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I have been coming to OBX all my life... That's 32 years... The fondest memories of my childhood were made on the Beaches of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.. The people on this island depend on tourist, especially the ones that go back year after year! The worst mistake will be mad if you choose to close the public access to ORV Driving! It's what gave the OBX its name! We now own a home in Kiity Hawk and traditionally travel down to Hatteras many times a summer to swim, chill, drive and fish on the beaches!

Please don't take the memories to be made away from my 3 daughters who think OBX is the Best Place on Earth!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13529    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13530    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** re: proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the

Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13531    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Hello, I am writing about Cape Hatteras and ORVs. I have been traveling to Cape Hatteras my entire life and like to visit as often as possible. I am drawn by the absolutely unique landscape and wildlife.

One thing that takes away from the enjoyment of this natural setting is the use of off-road vehicles. Aside from the noise and vehicles speeding by, they threaten the treasured wildlife that draw so many visitors like me to the area.

I understand there is a proposed regulation that applies to ORVs, which is excellent. However, it does not explicitly protect animal nesting areas for birds or sea turtles. Please ensure the wonderful wildlife on Cape Hatteras is protected and can flourish along with the use of off-road vehicles.

Thank you.

Alex

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13532    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

It should be made a national park so any regulations can be enforced by dnr & nps

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13533    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13534    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am for ORV access to the Cape Hatteras area. For years this area was doing just fine without closing the beaches and keeping fishermen from some of the best fishing areas on the east coast. Surfing and wildlife have been living together in that area for years and will continue to do so. The surf fishing people use only a few yards of beach and do not hurt the birds and turtles.

They also clean up the beach so turtles and birds do not eat so of the garbage that floats up on shore.

Keep the beaches open for ORV year round.

John Waxmunski

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13535    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** return the use of the use of the beaches at the cape hatteras national sea shore recreational area, to the use of all citizens as intended by the act of congress, that created the recreation area. all these presidential decrees the nps has been using to keep tax paying citizens from using the recreation area DO NOT superceed the act of congress. this is not a bird or animal santuary. besides the birds are not on the endangered species list. the nps spending huge amount of money to satisfy special interest groups the government is in the sad shape it is in today. THE NPS HAS NOT BEEN ACTING TO INSURE THE RIGHTS OF ALL CITIZENS. ESPECIALLY THE HANDICAPED.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13536    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I do not believe that off-road vehicles should be allowed to ride on the shoreline of Cape Hatteras. The wildlife will be threatened by the invasion of their habitat, both from the danger of having nesting sites disturbed and the stress of the presence and noise of the ORV. The wildlife was there first and their loss of habitat is endangered enough already. Off road vehicles do not constitute a part of Mother Nature's grand plan for wildlife viability. I believe the shoreline should be left alone for the existence and preservation of the wildlife that already lives there.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13537    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The proposed regulation for Cape Hatteras does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over.

We have made great progress in winning important protections for Hatteras' wildlife; ORV advocates want the entire seashore open to beach driving and this is unconscionable! I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

Let's stop destroying Mother Earth together and leave a strong legacy for our children, grandchildren and generations to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13538    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Regarding new regulations that will be enacted at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, I would only support a plan that guarantees adequate space and protections for wildlife, while still allowing responsible beach driving in some areas so that all visitors can fully enjoy this national treasure. As written, the proposed regulation does not mandate specific, science-based protections for the wildlife that depends on the Seashore. In fact, it protects ONLY the rights of off-road vehicle users. Protection of wildlife should be the primary goal of the new regs. Thanks. Tom Scott

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13539    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am concerned about the welfare of wildlife on the Hatteras sea shore. Please continue to protect these creatures from ORV

beach driving. ORV's should only be allowed in the sand dunes and away from wildlife nesting areas. Thank you for taking the time to read my comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13540    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I really, truly feel this ORV plan is a shame for our future generations. Restrictd access is not what the people who donated the land, residents, vacationers, business owners, fishermen envisioned or wanted. This whole project has been driven by private interest groups and government entities that can't see the forest due to the trees. The sad part is my kids (a 6 and a 2 year old daughter) will not be able to experience the fishing and the freedom that is being taken away with this proposed plan. I hope that Washington wakes up before it's too late for the Seashore and for the Country.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13541    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13542    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13543    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** While I appreciate the intention to protect species and the environment in this Proposed Rule, the Rule as written will do little more than negate the original principles of free and traditional access promised by the US Government to the People of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands when the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area was established. In 2000 characters:

Issuing vehicle-specific permits rather than Driver-specific permits does not address the concern of education. Permits should be Driver-specific a) to ensure each driver is educated per the Rule intent and b) to facilitate transfer of driver vehicle in cases of primary vehicle unavailability (due to sale, repair, etc). A simple digital photo being included in the permit would make this feasible.

No federal rule should include conjecture such as: "The presence of more Vehicle Free Areas (VFAs) for pedestrians, combined with increased parking for pedestrian access, could increase overall visitation and thereby help businesses to recoup some of the revenues lost as a result of ORV restrictions." Indeed, the vast majority of visitors come to Cape Hatteras to have free access to beaches that are not accessible by foot or road.

Nowhere in the Rule is there a provision for contesting closures - either to increase or decrease said VFAs. This needs to be



included to be consistent with the mission of the NPS to integrate Citizen Involvement not just in the pre-rule stage, but throughout the effect of the Rule.

This rule takes no action for alternative access other than, "we will seek funding for an alternative transportation study and consider applications for businesses to offer beach and water shuttle services." This in no way - especially in this economic environment - ensures that any alternate access will ever be considered in the future, let alone enacted. This needs to be corrected to abide by the spirit of clarity in the act of Rule making.

Thank you for your time and efforts in this matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13544    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13545    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13546    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13547    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13548    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect what little is left. It is a commodity that cannot be reproduced at the will of humanity but can be destroyed in full by the selfishness and greed of the "personhood" of corporation. What gain is that?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13549    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please see the attachments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13550    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please see the attachments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13551    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13552    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I don't want to see ATVs ruin the costal beaches and endanger the wildlife. I would ban driving for sport on the beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13553    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13554    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I hope that this law is not passed we need stress relief with all that goes on in the world today and many of us use Oregon Inlet as just that. I am all for the turtles and the birds, but I dont think limiting our driving on the beaches is going to save them God will take care of them he put them here and he can take them away. Thats what we need is more of God in our Government.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13555    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I feel like their should be free beach access to everyone. The beach has been open to free access to all this long why change it now, I also if you do this it will make everyone that comes down to the obx will not come down to the beach if you pass this so think about all the money that is spent every year down on the obx. so think twice about ya'lls rules before you go making changes to something that is free.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13556    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** To National Park Service - Reference RIN 1024-AD85

I'm writing in regards to certain points of concern in your proposed ORV rules. The discussion of these points are as follows: 1) ORV use permits should be a nominal fee. This fee should not be restrictive by cost, to drive the beach. The permit should be readily available through the internet, with a provision for senior citizens. 2) Permits for the special needs/handicapped person should not be so restrictive, requiring the means of transportation to leave the beach. This places the individual at a disadvantage if an emergency arises. Plus, the vehicle has to make 4 trips on the beach instead of two. 3) VFA's - should not be designaed in the park. The amount of usable beach is constantly changing thus placing limits on vehicles. I believe the superintendent should have the latitude to open and close beach access as indicated by conditions within the park. 4) Closure of beach access ramps should not occur until funding from D.C. is forthcoming for new ramps and parking areas. Closure of these areas would further stress/limit access for pedestrians and vehicles within the park.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13557    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and

pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13558    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** National Park Service RIN 1024-AD85 I would like to comment that section (c) (2) concerning the ORV permits seems to be unpractical and would cause undue financial hardship on the users of this National seashore. I do not support fees to use the park during a time when unemployment and financial difficulties are facing its users. I do not support fees but if they are instituted I feel they should be practical and not the high prices that are in place at other parks. Charging 150-200 dollars for a permit would cause people to quit using the park and would have an immediate effect on the local economy. I think season permits along the lines of a 25-50 dollar charge would be more in line with what people could afford. These permits should also be available through an online service. There is not any way that the park service could handle the amount of people wanting to obtain a permit and give classes on busy weekends efficiently. Another option might be if there has to be a class attended then the renewal the following years could be done online. The other part of the rule I would like to comment on is (c) (9) the designated routes rules. There has been much time and thought put in to this over the years but it looks like it is not going to make everyone happy. There are areas that I use that will be not allowed with this change but there are also other areas opened up. I would prefer as much open access as possible to keep the beaches safe for people and wildlife alike. Almost all the people that use this national seashore know what a treasure it is and respect it and its inhabitants. I believe that none of the current routes should be closed unless the new ramps and routes have been opened up. If areas are closed then this will lead to overcrowding with people upset that they have obtained a permit that now they cannot use. Also please give the superintendent the flexibility to use sound judgement and make adjustments to this rule as conditions change. Thanks Mike

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13559    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Don't let off-road vehicles and their owners destroy our native environment just because they don't want to walk. In earlier days of our country, people walke across the continent.

Ban these vehicles altogether on public lands

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13560    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13561    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please would you do all in your power to protect wildlife on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. We have only one chance of preventing decimation or extinction. Heavy recreational vehicles have no place in such a delicate environment.

Thank you,

Rosalind Ilett

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13562    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am writing regarding the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I am very concerned that the proposed regulation favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

ORV users are not the only stakeholders to our seashores!!

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13563    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am concerned about ATV use in the Cape Hatteras national seashore damaging bird and turtle habitat. I urge that larger protected areas be included. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13564    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I have been a frequent visitor to the Outer Banks (OBX) since 1981. I have watched the area grow over those 30 years, much as a result of visitors like me who come and spend money to enjoy good fishing areas that could be easily accessed along the beaches by ORV's. That is, until a few years ago when some knucklehead apparently had a run-in with the Park Rangers. Prior to that, I don't remember seeing or hearing about problem with ORV's on the beaches. I respect the sanctity of the beaches, the dunes and all the wildlife that live on and/or use them. However, as a result of a relatively small group of loud and well-funded environmental activists, many of the attributes of OBX that we have cherished over the years have been diminished. Many beaches are closed because some bird might be nesting in the area. I have made at least two trips to the OBX in the last couple of years only to find a high percentage of the dunes roped off and several ramps closed at the best fishing places. You cannot help but notice that more and more businesses are closing, because the people have come to realize that OBX is not open for the fishing that brought us there in the first place. If regulatory policy continues in the direction it is headed, the lives of a lot of decent and hard-working people are going to suffer irreparable harm. Already tourism is down due to the closing of beaches for ORV's, and there are even discussions of charging for ferry service and beach driving permits, which cannot be helpful in these difficult economic times. My overarching comment is succinct: keep all the beaches open all of the time. I oppose the extensive implementation of vehicle free areas (VFAs) based on only speculation, which is propped up by questionable scientific inquiry. While the proposed rule did not originate during the Obama Administration, if finalized as proposed, it will be another job-killing regulation helping to ensure a "one-and-done" Administration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13565    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

We have made great progress in winning important protections for Hatteras' wildlife , and we can't lose traction now. ORV advocates want the entire seashore open to beach driving. I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13566    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I have been visiting the outer banks for fishing and swimming for 45years and my parents did the same, before me. The access to 4 wheel drive vehicles needs to stay in place. Please do not take that away. I have never seen a vehicle kill any protected birds or turtles. Please keep this great recreational past time a live, because if you ban 4 x 4 access, the use will become greatly restricted.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13567    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicle traffic should be permanently banned at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore sine the numbers of migrating and permanent residence wild fowl would assuredly negatively impacted. Start protecting our wild areas and preserving our wildlife heritage.

Thank you\Laurence J Taylor

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13568    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I have been making a special trip in October and November to Hatteras Island since 1980 primarily for the purpose of fishing with my friends. We have traveled up and down the coastline and enjoyed the area very much. I also have a small beach cottage at Oak Island which is 3 hours from my home in the Research Triangle Area. I take the time to drive 5+ hours and pay to rent a cottage at Hatteras because of the good fishing and the beautiful coastline. The proposed regulations seem to be very onerous for those in my situation. Reducing the number of ramps, increasing regulations and costs would make it more difficult. I have also had the good fortune to visit other National Parks such as Yosemite, Yellowstone, Grand Canyon, etc. Nowhere have they created the kind of limitations you are proposing. Here is a reminder of the purpose of the original establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore: 1.1 CURRENT ORV REGULATIONS AND BACKGROUND "administered, protected, and developed by the National Park Service for national seashore recreational purposes for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." Everyone that makes this trip with me is very careful about the fishing regulations and the need to keep the national seashore clean. We also respect the wildlife. We hope that you will respect our situation and focus on the above purpose: the benefit and enjoyment of the people. Thank you. William R. White 625 Arlington St. Chapel Hill, N.C.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13569    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The rules for the governing of shorebirds and associated wildlife must be stricter. We need to stop the running of ORV on our beaches especially on Cape Hatteras because even though there are rules in place they don't protect the nesting areas of the birds. We must stop putting humans fun needs first at the expense of our wildlife its too important. Thank you for your concern and attention to this very important matter. Dr. Marybeth Kensicki

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13570    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I cannot understand how decisions that adversely impact wildlife can be given such little consideration.

We need to protect the living creatures that live alongside us. Allowing regulations for off-road vehicle use on the Seashore's beaches that jeopardize much-needed wildlife protections and put the future for birds like the Piping Plover, Least Tern, Black Skimmer, and many other shorebird species in doubt.

Please rethink what you are doing and how it will impact so many species.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13571    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As a beach and bird lover, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

Why should motorized recreation be allowed to harm wildlife and ruin recreation opportunities for non-driving visitors? The beach belongs to everyone, not just those with environment-destroying ORVs. Please create buffers for birds' nests and other wildlife.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13572    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** th

**Correspondence ID:** 13573    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I have loved our national parks and have visited them since a child, well over 50 years ago. I have seen them degrade with too many people, and I urge you to save Cape Hatteras for my grandchildren and great grandchildren to enjoy.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13574    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I have enjoyed the use of the Cape Hatteras beaches since I was a boy. I use to surf, fish and drive on the beach once I got my license. I am now a 40 year old man and have enjoyed raising my children on these same beaches. I have watched them go from building sand castles and collecting seashells as toddlers to learning to fish and now starting to Body board & surf. I have spent many a relaxing day and night fishing these beaches and intend to do so the rest of my life. It sickens me to no end to see tree hugging bird watchers most of which have never stepped foot on these shores dictating how everyone else may or may not use this public area. People have been driving on these beaches long before I was born and amazingly enough the wildlife and motorist have coexisted with out the loss of any species. It is still crazy to me that the Wildlife agencie is killing off others species of animals on the island at alarming rates to protect a non-native bird. When will all these intrusive governmental agencies start using some common sense and stay out of the publics affairs. Things have run quite well on the island for many, many years without some out of town, Know it all judge pushed by the Audubon Society trying to ruin a way of life for a lot of people. The kind of people who work hard for what they have, who love the out doors and respect the areas we use, the people who pay taxes and are goodcitizens until pushed to far by our government. Free country? Yeah right!

**Correspondence ID:** 13575    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. If you expand ORV use, this could severely hurt endangered wildlife. The Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. More vehicle free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. The proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional. This is not right. Please revise the plan to include buffers and more protection for wildlife. Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national wildlife treasure visited by millions of people each year, who like to enjoy this wildlife. Unrestricted ORV use will destroy this wildlife treasure. Please do more to regulate ORV use and protect the wildlife.

**Correspondence ID:** 13576    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

These comments on the proposed special regulation to govern off-road vehicle (ORV) use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore (the ?Proposed Rule?) are submitted by National Audubon Society (North Carolina State Office), Defenders of Wildlife, National Parks Conservation Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, Center for Biological Diversity, Sea Turtle Conservancy, and the Southern Environmental Law Center. Collectively, these organizations represent over 3.7 million members and supporters with an interest in protecting public lands, wildlife, and other natural resources, as well as the experiential, recreational, and educational opportunities that these lands provide. Cape Hatteras National Seashore is one of the last, best places on the East Coast where the public can visit wild beach environments that provide these opportunities.

We support a specific regulation for the use of ORVs within the Seashore. The regulation must include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. As written, the Proposed Rule does not do so. In addition, the Proposed Rule should set aside additional areas for those uses.

Finally, certain terms of the Proposed Rule should be modified, as described below.

1. Science-Based Resource Protections ? § 7.58(c)(10) The Proposed Rule, as written, does not contain sufficiently specific and enforceable protections for wildlife and other natural resources. As a result, it does not meet the purpose and need identified by the National Park Service, and it does not comply with controlling law. At the very minimum, the Proposed Rule should mirror the Selected Action from the NPS's Record of Decision (ROD), which was to implement Alternative F from the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) (although we believe that the better alternative remains Alternative D, the environmentally preferred alternative, which, according to the ROD "best protects the biological and physical environment). According to the FEIS, the purpose of the Proposed Rule is to carefully manage ORV use/access in the Seashore to protect and preserve natural and cultural resources and natural processes, to provide a variety of visitor experiences while minimizing conflicts among various users, and to promote the safety of all visitors."

(FEIS at p. 1)

The ROD states that the Proposed Rule will, among other things:

? Bring the Seashore in compliance with Executive Orders 11644 and 11989 respecting ORV use, and with NPS laws, regulations (36 CFR 4.10), and policies to minimize impacts to Seashore resources and values. . . . ? Provide for protected species management in relation to ORV use . . . . . ? Provide protection for threatened, endangered, and other protected species (e.g., state-listed species) and their habitats, and minimize impacts related to ORV and other uses . . . .

? Minimize impacts to wildlife species and their habitats related to ORV use. . . . ? Manage ORV use to allow for a variety of visitor use experiences.

? Minimize conflicts between ORV use and other uses.

(ROD at pp. 1-2)

In order to meet that purpose and accomplish those objectives, the Selected Action states that the NPS will implement the terms and conditions of the FEIS's Alternative F, ?as fully described in the final plan/FEIS, with one change? (that change being a requirement to increase protective buffers in response to disturbance of wildlife by kites). (ROD at p. 4) Alternative F, while inadequate to protect the natural resources on the Seashore, includes not only a designation of specific routes and areas that could potentially be open to ORV use (FEIS at pp. 103-108), but also includes very specific, enforceable, science-based measures designed to protect wildlife and other natural resources from ORV impacts. (FEIS at pp. 79-82, 113-144) These protective measures include:

? Pre-nesting closures in specific places at specific times, ? Designated vehicle-free areas that leave areas less disturbed for wildlife, ? Mandatory buffers of predetermined, species-specific sizes to be implemented around nesting birds and turtles, nests, turtle hatchlings, and unfledged chicks, to prevent disturbance of the species by ORVs, and

? Year-round vehicle-free areas for use by migrating and wintering birds for resting, foraging, and roosting.

The FEIS acknowledges that the specific natural-resource-protection measures are the very elements of Alternative F that allow it to meet the objectives listed above. (FEIS at pp. 145- 162) Indeed, the FEIS concludes that even full implementation of Alternative F meets the legal requirements for protected species, vegetation, and wildlife only "to a large degree," but not completely. (FEIS at p. 146) Those conclusions were expressly based on "increased buffer distances . . . and large, pre-determined buffers for breeding/nesting activity [that] would provide proactive (prior to breeding season) protection." Id. Similarly, the NPS's determination that Alternative F would be beneficial to the threatened piping plover is dependent on the "establishment of prescribed buffers." (FEIS at p. 150) Yet the Proposed Rule fails to include those specific measures or even to include any mandatory, enforceable measure at all to protect natural resources from ORV-related impacts.

Instead, the section of the Proposed Rule entitled "Superintendent's closures" (§ 7.58(c)(10)) is vague and permissive rather than mandatory, and is thus unenforceable. It states:

The Superintendent may temporarily limit, restrict, or terminate access to routes or areas designated for off-road use after taking into consideration public health and safety, natural and cultural resource protection, carrying capacity and other management activities and objectives, such as those described in the plan/FEIS. The public will be notified of such closures through one or more of the methods listed in § 1.7(a) of this chapter. Violation of any closure is prohibited. (Proposed Rule § 7.58(c)(10) (emphasis added))

The use of the term "may" renders the section permissive rather than obligatory. As written, the Proposed Rule seems to allow the Superintendent to choose whether, when, and to what extent to impose any limits or restrictions on ORV routes for resource protection. It allows the Superintendent to choose not to impose any closures at all, even in the presence of, for instance, protected species' nests or chicks that would warrant imposition of buffers under the FEIS and ROD. By leaving the decision whether, when, and to what extent to limit or restrict ORV routes to the Superintendent's discretion, the permissive nature of this section's wording renders the carefully crafted wildlife protections and buffer requirements of the FEIS and ROD moot. The use



of "may" in this section stands in marked contrast to the compulsory language used elsewhere in the Proposed Rule, such as "must", "is required", and "is prohibited".

FOOTNOTES It is essential that the regulation be at least as stringent as Alternative F. As we documented in comments on the DEIS, even Alternative F is not sufficiently protective of wildlife at Cape Hatteras and is not consistent with the applicable law.

As in § 7.58(c)(3): (i) The vehicle must be registered, licensed, and insured ?. (ii) The vehicle must have no more than two axles. ? (v) The vehicle must carry a low pressure tire gauge, ?"

As in § 7.58(c)(2)(i): A permit issued by the Superintendent "is required" to operate a vehicle on designated ORV routes at the Seashore.

As in § 7.58(c)(5): "The off-road operation of a motorcycle . . . is prohibited."

Even the section identifying ORV routes says absolutely that they are "designated" as ORV routes, not, for instance, that they "may be designated" in the discretion of the Superintendent. Obligatory, rather than permissive, terms in this section are necessary for the Proposed Rule to implement the selected alternative.

Likewise, the word "temporarily" is vague and subject to interpretation. Its use will likely lead to confusion and perhaps ultimately litigation over whether, for instance, a closure that is in place for a week or a month or a season is truly temporary. We recommend removal of the word "temporarily" from this section.

The words "after taking into consideration" and "such as those described in the plan/FEIS" also render the section permissive, as though none of the issues listed afterwards will give rise to a mandatory closure. They create instead the impression that the list of issues ? including public safety and natural resource protection ? are merely among those that could, but need not necessarily, be considered by the Superintendent in deciding whether to close an ORV route temporarily. These phrases also imply that, in those instances when the Superintendent chooses to exercise his discretion to impose limits on ORV routes, he is free to impose the exact buffers and other protections from the FEIS/ROD, but that he may also merely use them as a guideline, impose smaller buffers, or even ignore them altogether. Thus, these phrases conflict with the protections described in the FEIS and ROD and must be deleted.

More generally, because the buffer requirements and other wildlife protections are not codified anywhere in the regulation, they can be ignored or changed by the Superintendent without a formal rulemaking process. This section, as written, leaves all aspects of resource closures to the sole discretion of the Superintendent. In contrast, the ORV routes are designated very specifically in a chart, and they are not left to the Superintendent's discretion; accordingly, they may not be changed except by formal rulemaking procedures. This disparity between the treatment of ORV routes and resource protections creates a critical imbalance between the two competing interests addressed in the ROD and FEIS; to change the ORV routes, a formal rulemaking process would be needed, but to change the wildlife protections and buffers, only a favorably disposed or easily pressured Superintendent would be needed.

Furthermore, having the discretion to dictate resource closures will be an extremely onerous burden on any Superintendent who is dedicated to fulfilling the requirements of federal law through the implementation of the measures described in the FEIS and ROD. Local residents and ORV enthusiasts have already put enormous pressure on Park Service officials over the years to allow them ever greater freedom to drive whenever and wherever they choose. If the Proposed Rule remains as written, that pressure on the Park Service will only increase, as each Superintendent faces recurring demands to exercise his discretion in favor of imposing few resource protection closures or even ignoring the wildlife protection requirements of the FEIS and ROD altogether.

In addition, there are pending petitions for listing the red knot, a shorebird that uses Cape Hatteras during its spring and autumn migrations, as an endangered species, and the Park Service may need, in the future, to conduct research to determine appropriate conditions to protect red knots from ORV impacts. There may be other species that become listed as endangered, threatened, or a species of concern, and the Park Service will similarly need to conduct research into the needs of those species. It may become necessary, during the course of such research, to close ORV routes temporarily to determine, for instance, the effect of ORVs on the species and to discover which areas the species may be able to use as habitat. The regulation should, therefore, acknowledge that fact, and should include "research" among the considerations that can lead the Superintendent to limit, restrict, or terminate access to a particular route.

Last but not least, the omission of buffers and other resource protections from the Proposed Rule prevents it from fulfilling its purpose, satisfying the objectives listed above, and complying with applicable law. The FEIS statement of purpose and need, Executive Order 11644, 36 C.F.R. § 4.10, and the Consent Decree (FOOTNOTE: This refers to the Consent Decree entered in the lawsuit *Defenders of Wildlife v. National Park*) all require the NPS to promulgate a special regulation that designates ORV routes and areas in such a way that will protect and preserve wildlife, habitat, and other natural resources from ORV impacts and that will minimize conflicts among uses (for instance, conflicts between ORV use and wildlife protection or between ORVs and pedestrian visitors). By merely designating ORV routes without also including the buffers and other measures described in the FEIS/ROD that limit the routes for the protection of wildlife, the Proposed Rule cannot be said to satisfy any of those requirements.

Unlike the Proposed Rule, the following version of §7.58(c)(10) would uphold the compromise embodied in the FEIS and ROD, with the underlined portions being added and the stricken parts being deleted:

PEPC note: CAPS = new text, <> = stricken text

(10) Superintendent's closures. The Superintendent <may> SHALL <temporarily> limit, restrict, or terminate access to routes or areas designated for off-road use BASED ON <after taking into> considerations OF public health and safety, natural and cultural resource protection, carrying capacity, MINIMIZING CONFLICTS BETWEEN USERS, RESEARCH, and other management activities and objectives <such as those described in the plan/FEIS>. AT A MINIMUM, THE SUPERINTENDENT SHALL ENFORCE THE WILDLIFE PROTECTION MEASURES, BUFFER REQUIREMENTS, AND OTHER MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AND OBJECTIVES DESCRIBED FOR ALTERNATIVE F ON PAGES 79-82 AND 113-144 OF THE FEIS, INCLUDING WITHOUT LIMITATION IMPOSING PRENESTING CLOSURES AS DESCRIBED ON PAGE 138 OF THE FEIS AND IMPOSING OTHER CLOSURES IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROTECTIVE BUFFERS DESCRIBED THEREIN, SUMMARIZED IN THE FOLLOWING TABLE. The public will be notified of such closures through one or more of the methods listed in §1.7(a) of this chapter. Violation of any closure is prohibited.

Note: refer to table in attachment

In the alternative, the section could be re-written to include performance-based standards. For example, the section of the regulation could be amended as follows:

(10) Superintendent's closures. The Superintendent may temporarily limit, restrict, or terminate access to routes or areas designated for off-road use after taking into consideration public health and safety, natural and cultural resource protection, carrying capacity, MINIMIZING CONFLICTS BETWEEN USERS, RESEARCH, and other management activities and objectives, such as those described in the plan/FEIS. The public will be notified of such closures through one or more of the methods listed in §1.7(a) of this chapter. Violation of any closure is prohibited. IF POPULATION OR REPRODUCTION LEVELS FOR PIPING PLOVERS, AMERICAN OYSTERCATCHERS, LEAST TERNS, COMMON TERNS, GULL-BILLED TERNS, OR BLACK SKIMMERS DROP BELOW THOSE LEVELS ESTABLISHED IN THE 2010 BREEDING SEASON, THEN ORV USE WILL BE PROHIBITED THROUGHOUT THE YEAR IN THE AREAS WHERE THESE SPECIES BREED, ROOST, NEST, FORAGE, OR FLEDGE, OR MIGHT BREED, ROOST, NEST, FORAGE OR FLEDGE, UNTIL THE SPECIES RECOVERS TO 2010 LEVELS OR HIGHER.

In sum, the section must be amended to include specific details regarding the protective buffers and other wildlife protections described in the FEIS. The language must be amended to clarify that imposition of those protections, or more stringent provisions if future conditions or recovery goals are not being met, are mandatory as opposed to optional, in order for the section to comply with applicable law and to meet the purpose and need of the project.

## 2. ORV Routes ? § 7.58(c)(9)

Section 7.58(c)(9) affirmatively designates ORV routes without any indication that ORV use in those areas may be occasionally subject to mandatory limitations, restrictions, or prohibitions, for instance, when the beaches are closed for reasons related to natural-resource protection and public health and safety.

This omission ensures that the Proposed Rule will violate controlling law. As discussed above, Executive Order 11644, 36 C.F.R. § 4.10, and the Consent Decree all require the final regulation to include provisions to protect natural resources from ORV impacts. Similarly, section 1.4.3 of the National Park Service's Management Policies 2006 explains that, "when there is a conflict between conserving resources and values and providing for enjoyment of them, conservation is to be predominant." Likewise, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore enabling legislation provides that no "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 the area." 16 U.S.C. § 459a-2. Elevating ORV access above wildlife protections turns these provisions on their heads.

This omission ? failing to state explicitly that resource protection may lead to closures of ORV routes ? allows the Proposed Rule to be interpreted to contradict the FEIS and ROD and ensures that the regulation will not meet the purpose and need identified by the Park Service. For instance, the FEIS states that "ORV routes and vehicle-free areas under [Alternative F] would still be subject to temporary resource closures established when protected-species breeding behavior warrants" and to protect migrating or wintering birds as they forage, rest, and roost. (FEIS at p. 81; see also ROD at 15)

The section should therefore be amended to clarify that protection of natural resources predominates over access for ORV use. We suggest the addition of the underlined portions, so that the section reads as follows:

(9) ORV Routes. The following tables indicate designated ORV routes THAT MAY BE AVAILABLE FOR ORV USE SUBJECT TO THE MANDATORY RESOURCE, SAFETY, SEASONAL, AND OTHER CLOSURES IMPOSED PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION (10). The following ramps are designated as POTENTIALLY open to ORV use (ALSO subject to THE MANDATORY resource, safety, seasonal, or other closures IMPOSED PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION (10)) to provide access to ocean beaches: 2.5, 4, 23, 25.5, 27, 30, 32.5, 34, 38, 43, 44, 47.5, 49, 55, 59.5, 63, 67, 68, 70, 72. Soundside ORV access ramps are described in the table below. For a village beach to be open to ORV use during the winter season, it must

be at least 20 meters (66 feet) wide from the toe of the dune seaward to mean high tide line. Maps depicting designated routes and ramps are available in the Office of the Superintendent and for review on the Seashore Web site.

The performance-based standards proposed to be added to § 7.58(c)(10) above could also be added to this section.

In sum, the final regulation must be clear that ORV access is not guaranteed in the designated ORV routes, but rather that the natural resource protections of Alternative F of the FEIS will prevail by limiting the ORV routes and areas.

### 3. Additional Space for Vehicle-Free Recreation

For the reasons we more fully explained in our comments on the draft environmental impact statement and submitted on May 11, 2010, we believe that the Proposed Rule provides too few areas where ORV use is prohibited year-round for use and enjoyment by pedestrians and other visitors.

As the FEIS documented in detail, the overwhelming majority of visitors to the Seashore prefer not to use a vehicle to access the Seashore's beaches and place little value on ORV access to the beach. (FEIS at pp. 281-322) Yet the Proposed Rule disproportionately sets aside more than half of the Seashore's beaches for either seasonal or year-round ORV use. Although pedestrians can theoretically also use the sections of the beach that are set aside as ORV routes, they cannot practically do so without risking their personal safety and having their experience diminished by vehicle traffic, tire ruts, noise, and exhaust as well as the interruption of views of the natural landscape. More miles should, instead, be set aside for the many visitors who wish to enjoy the National Seashore in its natural state, so that they may enjoy fishing, surfing, swimming, sunbathing, windsurfing, kiteboarding, beachcombing, wildlife-watching, photography, etc., free from ORVs.

Cape Hatteras National Seashore already has too few areas where visitors can experience the Seashore's beaches without impacts from off-road vehicles. There are even fewer areas, arguably none, where a visitor can enjoy the Seashore's beaches without the sight of a vehicle on the landscape, the sound of a vehicle in the distance, and the visual impacts left by vehicles on the beach. Vehicle use jeopardizes the experience for visitors who come to the Seashore for wildlife-viewing and other wildlife-related activities, such as photography and other arts, and for the aesthetic enjoyment of scenic landscapes and the primitive beach environment. As written, the Proposed Rule perpetuates this reality. Even those miles of beach set aside as year-round vehicle-free areas are disproportionately those that are narrower and less scenic than those set aside for beach driving, and are still within sight and sound of ORV sections of the beach.

In particular, the opening of beaches to ORV traffic in front of residential developments eliminates opportunities for people to enjoy the unspoiled beach in front of their residences and rental properties. It also increases the risks to public safety. There have been numerous incidents in which vehicles have come close to striking pedestrians at Cape Hatteras, and a few incidents in which people have been harmed by beach driving, either by being in a vehicle that overturned on the beach or by being struck by an ORV. Many of these incidents have involved children. Nationally, people have been killed by ORVs where vehicles are allowed on beaches with pedestrians. Recent examples include small children at the Daytona and New Smyrna Beaches in Florida. There is a real fear that the Proposed Rule, by allowing more driving in front of populated areas than has historically been the case, will increase the likelihood of such tragic events.

In sum, we recommend that more miles be set aside for pedestrian-only access.

### 4. Special Use Permits ? § 7.58(c)(7)

Although § 7.58(c)(7), entitled "Special use permits for off-road driving, temporary use," is taken from page 120 of the FEIS, it has been altered in such a way as to fundamentally change its meaning and effect. The Proposed Rule deleted the final sentence describing Alternative F's plan for special use permit management, which states, "Temporary non-emergency use by nonessential vehicles would not be permitted within resource closure." FEIS at 120 (emphasis in original). This final sentence in the FEIS's description of Alternative F is crucial to the balance between ORV users and wildlife protections, and should be restored in the final regulation.

While special use permits are an important and necessary component of Seashore use for NCDOT, fishing tournaments, and mobility-impaired visitors, the FEIS makes clear that those special needs do not trump resource closures. The final sentence describing Alternative F clarifies that any nonessential ORV users, even those with special use permits, are not allowed within resource closures. Omission of this point in the regulation may lead to confusion in the event of a conflict between a special use and a resource closure. The FEIS and controlling law are clear about which takes priority: resource closures and the regulation should be, too. As explained above, federal law and Park Service policy dictate that a conflict between conservation and recreation must be resolved in favor of conserving natural resources.

Accordingly, we suggest that the Proposed Rule be amended as follows: (7) Special use permits for off-road driving, temporary use. The Superintendent may issue a special use permit for temporary off-road vehicle use to: (i) Authorize the North Carolina Department of Transportation to use Seashore beaches as a public way, when necessary, to bypass sections of NC Highway 12 that are impassable or closed for repairs; or (ii) Allow participants in regularly scheduled fishing tournaments to drive in an area if such tournament use was allowed in that area for that tournament before January 1, 2009; or (iii) Allow vehicular transport of mobility impaired individuals via the shortest, most direct distance from the nearest designated ORV route or Seashore road to a predetermined location in a designated vehicle-free area in front of a village; provided that, the vehicle must return to the

designated ORV route or Seashore road immediately after the transport. SUCH SPECIAL USE PERMITS ARE SUBJECT TO THE MANDATORY RESOURCE, SAFETY, SEASONAL, AND OTHER CLOSURES IMPOSED PURSUANT TO SUBSECTION (10). TEMPORARY NON-EMERGENCY USE BY NONESSENTIAL VEHICLES IS NOT PERMITTED WITHIN A RESOURCE CLOSURE

#### 5. Commercial Fishing ? § 7.58(c)(8)(i)

Although the spirit of this section of the Proposed Rule is in line with the FEIS, its wording may create an unintended consequence. As worded in the FEIS, Alternative F allows the Superintendent to permit a qualified commercial fishing vehicle to drive on a beach that is "not designated for off-road use, except for resource closures and lifeguarded beaches" ? that is, if a beach is closed to driving either for resource protection or because it is lifeguarded, it remains off-limits to commercial fishing vehicles. (FEIS at p. 124; see also FEIS at p. 383: "Commercial fishermen would be able to enter all areas except resource closures and lifeguarded beaches.")

In rephrasing the exception, the Proposed Rule appears to allow a commercial fisherman with a permit to operate a vehicle on a non-ORV beach in all instances unless the beach is both a resource closure and is lifeguarded. In other words, a beach that is subject to a resource closure would not be off-limits to a commercial fishing vehicle unless it is also lifeguarded. In practice, though, there may be little to no overlap in these two categories. Any beach at the Seashore is unlikely to be both a resource closure and to be lifeguarded, since the two uses are so incompatible.

A small revision will give the section a meaning that is more in line with the reality of Hatteras beaches and with the intent of the FEIS. We suggest amending the section to read as follows:

(8) Commercial Fishing vehicles. The Superintendent may authorize a commercial fishing permit holder when actively engaged in authorized commercial fishing to operate a vehicle on a beach: (i) Not designated for ORV use, provided the beach is NEITHER <not> subject to a resource closure NOR <and> is <not> lifeguarded; and (ii) Beginning at 5 a.m. on days when night driving restrictions are in effect, to set or tend haul seine or gill nets, if the permit holder is carrying and able to present a fish-house receipt from the previous 30 days.

The amendment brings the Rule in line with the intent of the FEIS and ROD, and allows qualified commercial fishermen to enter all areas except resource closures and lifeguarded beaches. That sentence makes clear that fisherman cannot enter resource closures, regardless of whether they are also lifeguarded, and cannot enter lifeguarded beaches, regardless of whether they are also resource closures. The small wording change will have major benefits for the safety of wildlife and pedestrians.

#### 6. Definition of ORV Corridor ? § 7.58(c)(1)

Section 7.58(c)(1) defines the term "ORV Corridor" in a way that is not sufficiently protective of wildlife, especially migrating and wintering shorebirds. Although we acknowledge that the definition in the Proposed Rule is similar to the definition in the FEIS, the FEIS also contained mandatory conditions related to imposing substantial "Species Management Areas", or "SMAs" throughout the Seashore, including at the points and spits, which modified the ORV corridors and affected the scope of the definition. References to those SMAs were erroneously omitted from the regulation. As a result, the definition of "ORV corridor" in the Proposed Rule has the effect of setting aside far more area for driving than it did in the FEIS, when it was clearly modified by the establishment of SMAs.

Additionally, throughout the Seashore, space at the toe of the Seashore's dunes is necessary year-round to give protected shorebird species adequate area to rest, roost, and seek shelter; the ocean intertidal zone, wrack line, and sandy beach landward of the high tide line are important for foraging, resting, and roosting shorebirds. The Park Service appears to have determined that an ORV corridor of 20 meters at the water's edge is sufficient, as evidenced by the way in which the FEIS and Proposed Rule both define a corridor when the beach is at least 30 meters wide. The definition of "ORV Corridors" should be based on the minimum width necessary, but measured from the high tide line, leaving the habitat at the toe of the dune, the intertidal zone, wrack line and immediately landward of the high tide line undisturbed by vehicles.

We recommend the following revisions:

ORV corridor means the actual physical limits of the designated ORV route in the Seashore. <The ORV corridor generally runs from the toe of the dune or the vegetation line on the landward side to the water line on the seaward side.> Where the DRY SAND ocean beach is at least <30> 60 meters wide above the high tide line, the landward side of the corridor will be 40 METERS LANDWARD OF THE HIGH TIDE LINE AND THE SEAWARD SIDE WILL BE 20 METERS FROM THE HIGH TIDE LINE <10 meters seaward of the toe of the dune.> THERE WILL BE NO ORV CORRIDOR IN AREAS WHERE THE DRY SAND OCEAN BEACH IS LESS THAN 60 METERS WIDE. The ORV corridor will usually be marked by posts on the landward AND SEAWARD side <(the seaward side of the corridor usually will not be posted).>

In addition, we ask that the following sentence be added to the definition of "ORV corridor" or to section 7.58(c)(10), in order to ensure that adequate areas are set aside for use by migrating and wintering shorebirds and other species for foraging, resting, and roosting:

"In addition, the Superintendent will establish and manage vehicle-free shorebird species management areas for the protection of

migrating and wintering species throughout the Seashore, including at all points and spits and along the ocean shoreline."

#### 7. Carrying Capacity ? § 7.58(c)(13)

This section of the Proposed Rule states that the "maximum number of vehicles allowed on any particular ORV route, at one time, is the linear distance of the route divided by 6 meters (20 feet)." According to the FEIS, this equates to 260 vehicles per mile. (FEIS at p. 81) For the reasons we more fully explained in our comments on the draft environmental impact statement and submitted on May 11, 2010, we believe that the carrying capacity in the final regulation should be much lower. The current limit of 260 vehicles per mile could result in approximately 10,500 ORVs on Seashore beaches at any given time, if the carrying capacity is maximized on all ORV routes. That is approximately four times the highest number of vehicles that has ever been recorded on Cape Hatteras's beaches in any given day.<sup>6</sup> In addition, as the Proposed Rule is currently written, it is not clear that all those vehicles must be spread throughout the Seashore.

That number of vehicles would result in significant recreational conflicts and increased environmental impacts, including degradation of soil, sand, vegetation, and wildlife habitat in violation of Executive Order 11644, especially if allowed to pack into a few small areas of the Seashore. We recommend a much lower carrying capacity and clarification that the density applies per mile of the beach, and not to the entire National Seashore. We recommend the following revisions:

(13) Vehicle carrying capacity. The maximum number of vehicles allowed on any particular ORV route, at one time, is the linear distance of the route divided by <6> 12 meters (<20>40 feet). THE DENSITY OF VEHICLES ON THE BEACH MAY NOT EXCEED 130 VEHICLES PER EACH MILE OF THE BEACH

#### 8. NPS's Exclusion of Fixed-Distance, Mandatory Buffers for Resource Protection Creates a New Alternative That Violates the National Environmental Policy Act and the Administrative Procedure Act.

As discussed above, the Proposed Rule departs from the FEIS's Alternative F and the ROD's Selected Action by excluding mandatory resource protections in favor of subjective, discretionary measures. In doing so, the Proposed Rule creates a new alternative, one that takes the unique approach of defining ORV routes and areas, but leaving resource protections undefined and discretionary. None of the alternatives evaluated in the FEIS took this approach; each alternative studied and implemented standardized, obligatory buffers. To be sure, the fixed buffers of Alternative A were woefully inadequate, but they were consistent with the overall approach of pairing designated ORV routes with fixed buffers related to breeding and nesting behavior. The ROD reflected the dual components, stating that the designation of routes and areas "in conjunction with the species management strategies described in the final plan . . . will provide for species protection . . . using the standard set of buffers." (ROD at 5) The Proposed Rule jettisons this approach, focusing on ORV routes.

#### FOOTNOTES:

According to one news report, the highest number of drivers ever recorded on a given day (as of the day of that report) was 2,557 on the July 4th holiday in 2008. Irene Nolan, New dispatches from the beachfront: Access update, getting smart about beach driving, manners and laws, and July 4 report, ISLAND FREE PRESS, <http://www.islandfreepress.org/2008Archives/07.11.2008-ShootingTheBreezeNewDispatchesFromTheBeachfront.html>.

The ROD states that Alternative A "has the potential for impairment to sea turtles, common terns, gullbilled terns, and black skimmers" and would "impede the Seashore's desired future conditions for protected species." (ROD at p. 13)

As a result, it not only fails to protect wildlife on the Seashore, it runs afoul of the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") and the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA").

#### a. The Proposed Rule's new alternative violates NEPA.

NPS's decision to adopt a new alternative in the Proposed Rule violates NEPA in three ways. First, the Proposed Rule selects an alternative that is outside the range of alternatives considered within the EIS. Second, by selecting that alternative, the Proposed Rule adopts an alternative that has not undergone the "hard look" required by NEPA. Third, because it was not included in the EIS, NPS has not provided the public or other governmental agencies the opportunity to analyze and substantively comment on the alternative in the Proposed Rule and its implications for wildlife protection. Because of these shortcomings, the new alternative articulated in the Proposed Rule must be fully evaluated in a supplemental EIS before it can legally be finalized.

Under NEPA's implementing regulations, the selected alternative must be "encompassed by the range of alternatives discussed in the relevant environmental documents." 40 C.F.R. § 1505.1(e). As described above, the Proposed Rule fails to prescribe any fixed-distance, mandatory buffers for resource protection. Each alternative considered in the EIS, however, included mandatory, fixed-distance buffers. (NOTE: See FEIS at p. 144 (chart showing fixed buffer distances under each alternative).

In contrast, the Proposed Rule provides that the "Superintendent may temporarily limit, restrict, or terminate access," without requiring any specific restrictions. 76 Fed. Reg. at 39,356. Thus, the Proposed Rule cannot, under any interpretation, be considered to be within the range of alternatives of the EIS or representative of Alternative F as it was selected in the ROD. Nor does it purport to be within that range; it merely states that it "implements portions of the plan/FEIS and ROD." 76 Fed. Reg. at

39,354. By doing so, it selects an alternative outside of the range of those considered in the FEIS and violates NEPA.

Further, adopting a new alternative in the Proposed Rule frustrates the central purpose of NEPA and the EIS process. The alternatives analysis is often described as the heart of the EIS and requires that agencies take a "hard look" at the environmental impacts of their actions. *Nat'l Audubon Soc'y v. Dept of the Navy*, 422 F.3d 174, 184 (4th Cir. 2005). That analysis "encompasses a thorough investigation into the environmental impacts of an agency's action and a candid acknowledgement of the risks that those impacts entail. Id. at 185. It is "surely implicated when the environment that may be damaged is one that Congress has specially designated for federal protection," as are the wildlife and habitat at the Seashore. Id. at 186-87. There, the "hard look" must "take particular care to evaluate how its actions will affect the unique biological features of th[e] congressionally protected area." Id. at 187. The Proposed Rule ignores these requirements, extracting the ORV routes and other requirements from Alternative F as described in the FEIS and ROD, yet omitting the mandatory resource protections that would provide the environmental benefits described by Alternative F. The resulting new alternative has not been given the "hard look" required by NEPA and its environmental consequences are, at best, unknown. Its approach to resource protection drastically differs from each of the alternatives considered in the FEIS and has not been studied to any degree.

Finally, NPS's promulgation of a new alternative in the Proposed Rule also violates NEPA's purpose of providing an opportunity for the public and governmental agencies "to analyze and comment on the action's environmental implications." 422 F.3d at 184. Here, neither the public nor federal and state wildlife agencies had the opportunity to comment on the environmental implications of the alternative reflected in the Proposed Rule. (NOTE: The opportunity to comment on the Proposed Rule does not ameliorate this violation. For major federal actions, like this rule, that opportunity for public comment is only meaningful if it is preceded by a full analysis of the proposed action in an EIS, a step the NPS has failed to take with its new alternative.)

The FEIS did not forecast that NPS was considering an alternative devoid of mandatory, specified buffers and the public could not have anticipated that such an alternative would be introduced during the rulemaking period. Nor can NPS rely on the inclusion of Alternative F in the FEIS to satisfy NEPA's public notice requirements. The benefits provided by Alternative F, while not adequate to protect all natural resources within the Seashore, rely on fixed, mandatory buffers; they would significantly exceed the environmental benefits, if any, of the Proposed Rule and cannot put the public on notice of its environmental consequences. See *Hughes River Watershed Conservancy v. Glickman*, 81 F.3d 437, 446-47 (4th Cir. 1996) (stating that misleading representation of benefits can violate NEPA "by skewing the public's evaluation of a project"). The only legal path forward for NPS if it decides to implement the Proposed Rule is first to prepare and disseminate a supplemental EIS that takes a legitimate "hard look" at the consequences of a regulation that contains no mandatory, science-based wildlife protections. A supplemental EIS is required if an "agency makes substantial changes in the proposed action that are relevant to environmental concerns." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.9. The exclusion of fixed-distance, mandatory buffers is clearly a "substantial change" that is "relevant to environmental concerns." To be clear, we do not support a supplemental EIS or a regulation without mandatory, sciencebased wildlife protections; NPS can only comply with the court-ordered deadline to complete this rulemaking by implementing the changes to the Proposed Rule described above and should do so no later than November 15.

b. The Proposed Rule violates notice and comment requirements of the APA. By implementing a new alternative that was not studied in the FEIS, the Proposed Rule violates the APA's notice and comment requirements. Under the APA, the notice of the Proposed Rule "must be sufficiently descriptive of subjects and issues involved so that interested parties may offer informed criticism and comments." *Ethyl Corp. v. EPA*, 541 F.2d 1, 48 (D.C. Cir. 1976). The purpose of that description is "to disclose the thinking of the agency and the data relied on." *Lloyd Noland Hosp. & Clinic v. Heckler*, 762 F.2d 1561, 1565 (11th Cir. 1985). An agency that fails to reveal the technical basis for its rule "commits serious procedural error." *Conn. Light & Power Co. v. Nuclear Regulatory Comm'n*, 673 F.2d 525, 530 (D.C. Cir. 1982).

Because the alternative presented in the Proposed Rule was not evaluated in the FEIS, the NPS has not presented an analysis evaluating the environmental impact of the Proposed Rule, provided any scientific evidence for its ORV-route-only approach, or made available any of the data that undergirds this approach, if any exists. Therefore, the Proposed Rule does not "disclose the thinking of the agency" and does not provide sufficient information for the public to allow us to submit "informed criticism and comments" on the analyses and data that purportedly support the Proposed Rule.

Further, adopting this new alternative in a final rule would be arbitrary and capricious. Under the APA, courts "shall ... hold unlawful and set aside agency action, finding, and conclusions found to be - (A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion or otherwise not in accordance with the law." 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(A). Nothing in the record before the agency supports NPS's conclusion that a purely discretionary resource protection program will provide adequate environmental benefits. To the contrary, the record is replete with evidence that discretionary measures before the creation of the Interim Plan in 2007 and the mandatory measures within the Interim Plan - embodied in Alternative A of the FEIS - were inadequate to protect resources and contributed to declines in breeding shorebirds, water birds, and sea turtles. The ROD makes clear that "[p]rotected species and wildlife mitigation measures are integral parts of the selected action" that are necessary to mitigate for impacts to wildlife. ROD at 7. Without these "integral parts," NPS has no basis to claim that the Proposed Rule will protect resources on the Seashore.

#### Conclusion

We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and the 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 a final regulation that addresses and incorporates our concerns, and restores a balance to the Seashore consistent with NPS's stewardship obligations to restore and protect the natural resources and leave them unimpaired for future generations.

**Correspondence ID:** 13577    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** American Bird Conservancy (ABC) appreciates the chance to submit comments regarding the National Park Service's Off-road Vehicle Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Administering multiple-use management plans for undeveloped coastal public lands and accompanying wildlife is inevitable given a growing population, a shrinking coastline due to development and erosion, and sea level rise. While Alternative F adopts important conservation and protective measures for beach-nesting birds, we remain concerned that detrimental effects to breeding and wintering shorebirds from off-road vehicle (ORV) use will persist. This Seashore has been identified as a Globally Important Bird Area by ABC and many species using this habitat are federally or state protected.

It will be imperative to continue posting nesting areas as early in the breeding season as possible, implement the designated buffer zones around these sites, enforce pet restrictions, and conduct public outreach to educate Seashore users about species protected by the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. As we are all aware, the park is a seasonal and/or year-round host to the federally Threatened Piping Plover, ESA Candidate Red Knot, state Threatened Gull-billed Tern, and many Species of Special Concern in North Carolina such as, Wilson's Plover, American Oystercatcher, Least Tern, Common Tern, and Black Skimmer. These species and others using this habitat are important natural and cultural resources at Cape Hatteras, for the state of North Carolina, and for the entire country. Restricting ORV use and implementing adaptive protective measures in a dynamic coastal environment will be critical to successful wildlife and recreation management.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13578    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As a 20-year former resident of North Carolina, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I know this has been a long process requiring much compromise, but let's not end it without a final commitment to the first mandate of the seashore - to protect the natural resources.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13579    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I won't take my family to stay at an unsafe beach. I thought you guys were smart enough to at least protect tourists interests.

R. Vanstrien

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13580    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am aginst any restrictions or reglations having to do with ORV or human usage of Cape Hatteras National Seashore beaches. We the people should have open access to these beaches either by ORV or by foot both by day and night! This is what this area was set up for!. I have read through many comments left on this and noticed most of the people commenting against ORV use in Hatteras have never been there and have no idea what Hatteras is about. Wake up people, the area in question is set up for human use. We have Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge right down the road which is a sizable amount of land dedicated to protecting animals and thier habitat.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13581    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do everything possible to protect wildlife from the danger posed by off road vehicles at the National Seashore!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13582    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13584    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses. NC has a unique coastal heritage protecting wildlife and this is a prime opportunity to continue that heritage

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13584    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** CHNSRA has been a favorite vacation destination of mine for decades. Being close to my residence, it is also a favorite weekend getaway for me as well. Prior to the CD I used to come to Hatteras very often. From late March until the end of January I would be there just about every weekend responsibly enjoying the recreational area. My family and I would also spend two weeks there as a vacation in April. Once the CD was implemented, we changed our vacation to October, much to the dismay of the women in my family, and I stopped coming in the spring all together. CHNSRA is my favorite place in the world, and I believe the NPS is trying to fundamentally alter a way of life for the residents, visitors, my family and I as users of CHNSRA. Long have we had access to the recreational area while coexisting with nature. Most of the residents and visitors have the utmost respect for this resource, as evidenced by the remarkably clean beaches, and the relationship that was once very healthy with the NPS. Since the inception of the CD, I have seen this relationship broken. No longer is the NPS here to serve the users of CHNSRA, but they are now here to unlawfully keep the public out of their recreational area. This is a tragedy. Seeing this process of an ORV management plan take shape over the past five or so years has left me with a bad taste in my mouth. The IMS (Interim Management Strategy) was not allowed to be what it was designed for before a few environmental activist groups sued NPS over their IMS, in direct conflict of terms of being a part of the Negotiated Rulemaking Committee. Once the CD was signed, these groups DOW, NAS, SELC had no incentive to negotiate in good faith. They should have been removed from the process, but because of a technicality and leniency, they were not. Having been to and commented at these meetings, the NPS should be ashamed that tax dollars were wasted in such a fashion. Many times during this process, it was clear what these environmental groups wanted, a total closure of CHNSRA to people and ORV. When congress created CHNSRA they did so "for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." It has remained clear throughout this process that the NPS has been catering to these environmental groups with complete disregard for the residents, visitors, and the enabling legislation. Why? Just because these groups have money, political lobbying power, and many of them are in bed with and related to (Destry Jarvis and Jon Jarvis) the management of NPS/DOI does not mean the NPS has the legal authority to usurp congress in direct conflict of the enabling legislation that created CHNSRA. I have written my US Senators and my Congressman in regards to this issue since the implementation of the CD. All I have received in return has been form letters and brush offs. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed rule, but as evidenced in the scoping of this process, the NPS has already made up their minds on what is coming, and these comments are a mere formality. I suggest a modified IMS. Keep everything in place like it was, and institute a substantial educational component, and make the penalties for breaking the rules severe enough to deter people from breaking the rules. I contend this is the best way for the NPS to fulfill its legal obligations regarding the administration of CHNSRA as specifically provided for by Congress. My subsequent comments will go to further this discussion.

In the Organic Act of 1916, it states "derogation of the values and purposes for which these various areas have been established, except as may have been or shall be specifically provided for by Congress." When one reads the enabling legislation, it is clear what congress intended CHNSRA to be, hence the name, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area. I do not know why, but would like to know why NPS does not acknowledge this. Furthermore, it is clear that NPS envisions CHNSRA to be a wildlife refuge, in direct conflict of the enabling legislation. There is already a NWR (Pea Island) within the confines of CHNSRA, yet it seems as though this NWR is being extended to CHNSRA unlawfully. The enabling legislation 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, the said areas shall be 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." There are many areas of CHNSRA that are especially adaptable for recreation, including all points and spits, yet the NPS continues to ignore this and is using the padlock management approach to the area instead of developing the area for such uses as needed, as legally bound by the enabling legislation. In regards to E.O. 11644, there have always been routes and areas for the operation of ORV at CHNSRA. To suggest NPS has been in direct conflict of this is false. Preservation of wildlife and natural resources is not to take place without proper consideration of, and accommodation to these other objectives. For example, the Organic Act states that the NPS is to "promote and regulate the use" of national parks, in conformity with the fundamental purpose of such parks, which is not only to "conserve scenery and natural historic objects and the wildlife therein," but to also "provide enjoyment of the same." The statute reveals Congress's intent to create a National Park System for "the common benefit of all people of the United States." Thus, it is manifest that Congress, in creating the NPS, intended our national parks to be visited and used, not padlocked. The NPS has likewise recognized these fundamental aspects of its management obligations. The NPS Management Policies 2006 states "enjoyment of park resources and the values by the people of the United States is part of the fundamental purpose of all parks. The NPS is committed to providing appropriate, high quality opportunities for visitors to enjoy the parks, and NPS will maintain within the parks an atmosphere that is open, inviting, and accessible to every segment of American society." These considerations are especially significant at CHNSRA. The enabling act that created CHNSRA requires that the land be "set apart as a national seashore for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." Significantly, Section 3 of the enabling act specifically reserved the right of legal residents to earn a livelihood fishing within the boundaries of CHNSRA. Section 4 states "certain portions of the area are 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." Thus, section 4 specifically recognized that areas traditionally used for recreation should be continued to be so used. This language trumps claims made by certain environmental groups that Congress intended to create a wilderness preserve or a wildlife protection zone. This Enabling legislation is important in two regards. First, Congress's original designation of the seashore as a "recreational area" indicates congress specifically wanted recreation to predominate at CHNSRA. See Federal Executive Branch Policy Governing the Selection, Establishment, and Administration of National Recreational Areas by the Recreational Area Advisory Council, Circular No 1(Mar. 26,1963).("Within National Recreational Areas, outdoor recreation shall be recognized as the dominate or primary resource management purpose. If additional natural resource utilization is carried on, such additional use shall be compatible with fulfilling the recreational mission, and none will be carried on that is significantly detrimental to it.") See also, NPS Administrative Policies for the Recreational Areas of the National Park System ("Congress extended the role of the Service still further in the management of recreation areas when it established Cape Hatteras National Seashore in 1937?The 1937 act said this first national seashore was 'especially adaptable for recreational uses?'" Second, no evidence suggests that Congress ever modified its original intent because it has never designated any part of CHNSRA as "wilderness" under the 1964 Wilderness Act, and therefore made subject to restrictions to motorized recreation. Had Congress wanted to turn CHNSRA into a wilderness area and alter its status as a recreational area, it would have done so under the 1964 statute, but it did not. In conclusion regarding EO 11644, the IMS was adopted in all essential respects under procedures that are functionally equivalent to a special rule under 36 C.F.R. 410 that is, the IMS regulation of ORV routes and areas are consistent with, and as stringent as, the requirements in 36 C.F.R. 1.5 and EO 11644. Therefore the DEIS, FEIS, and proposed rule should utilize the routes and areas under the IMS, not the three aforementioned proposals set forth by NPS. Furthermore, the proposed rule is in derogation of the enabling legislation and the congressional intent in the establishment and administration of CHNSRA. The proposed rule states "beach driving was primarily for the purpose of transportation, not recreation." The NPS fails to realize that beach driving is the means used to recreate and get to spots that are especially adaptable for recreation. Most, if not all areas of the beach used for recreation are long distances away from parking, and the lots that are available are usually filled to capacity. Not only are all points and spits a significant distance from parking, but in order to effectively fish the area, an ORV is not just preferred but required. As having made the "feet wet" walk to Cape Point myself, the steep beach puts people into an unnecessarily dangerous situation, and this process should be modified to allow for the most access allowed, because after all, this is a RECREATION AREA. The supplies and provisions are too heavy to be carried from the parking areas to the points and spits, furthermore ORV can be used to lessen the effects of weather on the visitor. The proposed rule also states that since 1963, "a dramatic increase in vehicle use on seashore beaches." I take exception with this entire statement. During Reg-Neg, the Vogel song study was used as a tool to gauge visitor usage, it was peer reviewed and deemed useless, yet the NPS said it was "best available". This process using the "best available" even though it was acknowledged as useless should be abandoned by the NPS. Also, there are flyovers on holiday weekends and these are used as what CHNSRA looks like every day. This is misleading and should be abandoned as well. There are also counters on some ramps that make things look better than they are. Essentially, you could drive back and forth across the and trip the sensor 100 times a day, but this makes the results of the counters useless as well. Some counters were at ramps that were a cul-de-sac. Therefore, when you drive out and see the amount of beach open, and the amount of people already there, you simply turn around and look for a place that is open and less crowded. NPS did not take this into account, and therefore the NPS has no real ideas as to the actual amount of true visitation. Also, the cost benefit analysis by RTI was done after the implementation of the CD, therefore those numbers should be tossed out as well. It is a shame the numbers NPS is putting up as visitation. I can tell you personally, I know of many people who are simply not returning to CHNSRA. They are not writing comments and are simply going somewhere else. I am a red drum fisherman, and can tell you about 80% are just flat out not coming anymore. We cannot go back to 2007 or before and get visitor information, but just ask the residents, they will tell you. If the beaches are open people will come, if they are closed people will not come. Me personally, I will not set foot on CHNSRA during the spring. All of the places I wish to go have gone to the birds, unlawfully I might add. This is the same as going to Disneyworld and 80% of the rides are closed. At CHNSRA my rides are closed too, namely Cape Point, Hatteras Inlet, and Ocracoke Inlet. The proposed rule states, "motivated in part by a decline in most beach nesting bird populations on the Seashore since the 1990s". Again I take exception with this entire statement. In many cases the birds have simply moved to a more suitable habitat because of the gross neglect by NPS in regards to habitat maintenance. If you simply look out into the sound during nesting season, you will see vast colonies of terns and skimmers nesting on the dredge islands, yet because those islands are technically not part of the seashore, they are not counted. Even though Pea Island NWR is within the boundaries of CHNSRA as well, these numbers are left out of the counts as well. I contend if they were counted, there would not be a decline at all. The birds just moved to a more suitable habitat. Furthermore, not clearing the vegetation gives predators access and forces the birds away from suitable habitat. It is also known that there are colonies of terns that have chosen to nest on flat rooftops. But these birds are not counted either. Why? Could it be that it does not further the agenda of DOW, NAS, and SELC? It is a shame this is how things are, and I believe the game is rigged in favor of the environmental groups and their wishes. This is deplorable and outraging. In regards to nesting CWB at CHNSRA, it seems as though the NPS is cherry picking the science so as to exclude the public from their recreational area. There is plenty of scientific evidence that the NPS simply ignores because it does not suit the purpose of the environmental

groups. Why does the NPS continue to cater to these environmental groups? In regards to Piping Plovers, referenced here are some quotes from studies the NPS should look into regarding the management of the aforementioned species. "Higher productivity appeared to be only slightly correlated with increasing distance from parking lots, roads, residential areas and little to no difference in mean productivity was observed among levels of ORV use." Thomsen 2006, Mean Productivity of Piping Plovers on the Barrier Islands of Long Island, NY. So no difference in productivity in levels of ORV access, yet the NPS wants 1000 meter buffers around chicks? Why? No other NPS managed seashore has buffer distances this size. Why is it being implemented at CHNSRA? "When all years pooled together (2003, 2004, 2005) mean productivity was not significantly great between levels of ORV access." Thomsen, 2006 Mean Productivity of Piping Plovers on the Barrier Islands of Long Island, NY. So no change in productivity even in levels of unrestricted ORV access, yet the NPS continues to cherry pick the studies to shut the public out of their recreation area. Why? "Perhaps more unexpected is the apparent lack of effect of ORV access on productivity. However, even though in some years productivity was quite high in areas of unrestricted ORV access, the success of these nests had little effect on overall productivity." Thomsen 2006, Mean Productivity of Piping Plovers on the Barrier Islands of Long Island, NY. Seems as though if there is unrestricted access or no access, the birds will be fine either way, so why not have CHNSRA open for the benefit and enjoyment of the people for which it was created? Collazo 1995 "Found that Piping Plovers are only rarely disturbed by encounters to people, ORV, and planes." If Piping Plovers are only rarely disturbed, then what is the justification for the 1000 meter buffer around chicks? What are the qualitative and quantitative benefits to the species for the 1000 meter buffer other than unjustly shutting out the public from their recreational area? Collazo 1995 "At present levels of park use, park closures would likely have minimal effect on Piping Plover reproductive success." So the science says there is minimal effect and yet again the NPS would rather use the padlock management approach than let the recreating public use their recreational area. Collazo 1995 "Recommend ORV use be allowed at Cape Point and Hatteras Inlet." Why does NPS want to stop ORV use at Hatteras Inlet? The FEIS says some users want an inlet experience without ORV. Well up on Pea Island within the confines of CHNSRA there is a VFA for an inlet experience, no need for redundancy here. Hatteras Inlet also has significant recreational value, yet it will be a VFA forever. I take serious exception with the proposed VFA at Hatteras Inlet. Collazo 1995 "Recommend vegetation removal from Cape Point along the south shore of the brackish pond, growth should be monitored and maintained." Here again the NPS wants a pilot program to study vegetation removal when as far back as 1995 the need has been neglected by the NPS. If the habitat had been maintained all along, the birds could be successful and the people could utilize their recreational area, but the NPS again prefers the padlock management technique and catering to environmental groups. Collazo 1995 "Protection of nesting sites has allowed beach nesters to be successful most years in spite of heavy use of beaches by people." So, NPS, why the need for 1000 meter buffers around Piping Plover chicks? Seems as though people and Piping Plovers can coexist, why the padlock management approach? Why does the NPS continue to cater to the environmental groups when they should be catering to the recreating public? Collazo 1995 "Preservation of interior wet and mud flats at CAHA is critical, otherwise Piping Plovers may only find suitable foraging habitat along the ocean intertidal zone where human disturbance is a likely problem. At present, beach closures are unnecessary and not likely to favorably impact breeding Piping Plovers on the islands." Hmmm, the science says beach closures are unnecessary, yet NPS continues to cherry pick its science and cater to the environmental groups. Why? Loegering and Fraser 1995 "Chicks on Assateague Island, MD that were able to reach bay beaches and the island interior had significantly higher fledge rates than those that foraged solely on the open beach." Seems as though the birds prefer the interior areas and it is beneficial for them to do so, yet with the gross neglect of the habitat, therefore the beach is the only place for the birds to nest. Piping Plover Recovery Plan 1996 USFWS 3.2 "It is presently unclear whether the apparent coincidence of nesting plover sites in the southern part of the range with access to lightly vegetated bayside intertidal areas and ephemeral pools is indicative of greater dependency of breeding plovers on these habitats at lower latitudes than is seen in New England. Elucidation of this issue would greatly facilitate decisions about what types of protection measures are likely to benefit plovers of NY, NJ, and the southern units." Seems as though the science is saying plovers in the southern range do better off the beach, at the interior areas, but the NPS chooses to ignore this science and force the birds onto the beach, a direct result of the gross neglect of the interior area habitat once utilized by many CWB, not just piping plovers. Piping Plover Recovery Plan 1996 3.21 "(Loegering and Fraser 1995, and Elias-Gerken 1994) have further suggested that Piping Plover requirements for foraging resources may be more specialized south of New England." It seems as though the NPS is again ignoring the science and forcing the birds on the beach, where the qualitative and quantitative foraging opportunities are much less. Why? Piping Plover Recovery Plan 1996 "Benefits of protection efforts that increase plover productivity will not be realized if habitat loss and degradation reduce opportunities for recruitment into the breeding population." Seems as though this is exactly what has happened and is happening at CHNSRA yet again with the gross neglect of the interior habitat. I do not understand why the NPS needs to implement a pilot program, when the science clearly says otherwise. Piping Plover Recovery Plan 1996 "Intensive protection efforts will not translate into breeding success without maintenance of physical habitat characteristics." Again, this has played out to the tee here at CHNSRA, yet again the park service is to blame here with the gross neglect of the interior habitat. Piping Plover Recovery Plan 1996 Appendix L "Establishment of four recovery units is not supported by taxonomic reasons, and their establishment will make it virtually impossible to achieve target numbers." It seems as though the Piping Plover will never come off the endangered species list and is being used as a tool to keep the public off the beaches forever all over the east coast. This screams of manipulation, impropriety and is also being used as justification for jobs in the government when there is no need for it, not to mention the unfair burden to taxpayers and is money that does not need to be spent. Atlantic Coast Piping Plover Recovery Plan: Recovery Tasks 1.241 "Encourage deposition of dredged material to enhance existing nesting habitat or create new nesting habitat." 1.242 "Discourage vegetation encroachment at nest sites." Why is the NPS not adhering to the Recovery Plan tasks? It seems as though the NPS is doing the exact opposite of the science, allowing vegetation overgrowth, and forcing the birds out on the beach where weather, predation, and reduced foraging opportunities all lead to reduced reproductive success. Why? McCollugh 2000 Maine DIFW "An increase from 20 pairs in 1938 to 64 in 1941 (hurricane) attests the Piping Plover's ability to rapidly colonize newly available habitat." This statement means as soon as habitat is available, the Piping Plover would utilize it. If habitat restoration were done at the pond at Cape Point, I would bet there would be an increase in the number of breeding plovers, but I fear the NPS would rather use the padlock management approach rather than actually help the birds and give people access to their recreational area. Parnell 1989 "Significant habitat changes have occurred at CAHA over the past 25 years. In particular, the abundance of grassland and sparsely vegetated upper beach has decreased and large sections of high beach have become vegetated. Some of these changes occurred at sites that at one time had significant numbers of ground nesting terns and shorebirds." Even as far back as 1989 this has been going on and the NPS has refused to manage the habitat and the birds have looked for more suitable nesting habitat and are only left with the ocean beach. In conclusion from the aforementioned studies, I draw the conclusion that the issue is not about the birds, but is about control and getting people off the beach. This is unacceptable, deplorable and illegal. In the proposed rule it states "The lawsuit was resolved in April of 2008 by a Consent Decree agreed to by the plaintiffs, the NPS, and the interveners, Dare and Hyde counties and a coalition of ORV and

fishing groups." This gives the appearance that all was well with the CD, even though it was a gross miscarriage of justice and due process, something this nation was founded on. There was no opportunity given to the interveners to present evidence or even make a case. This was a back room deal done without public comment and is a travesty. The CD violated NEPA, the Federal Administrative Procedures Act, the Organic Act and the Fair Look Doctrine to name a few. Nor was it vetted by congress and is in direct conflict of the enabling legislation. The proposed rule Q and A section has some misleading characteristics to say the least. "Does the ORV permit guarantee that all designated ORV routes will be open for me to use? No. In addition to the referenced seasonal restrictions, ORV routes are also subject to temporary resource and safety closures. However, past experience indicates that substantial sections of the beach that are designated as ORV routes would remain open for ORV use when other sections are temporarily closed." Having this answer say "substantial sections of the beach would remain open" is misleading. The NPS also includes VFA as "substantial sections". While technically true, there are many instances where there are sections of beach that are open but are bound by closures on both sides, rendering the area closed, even though it is technically open. This area should be counted as closed, because the only way to access the area would be by helicopter or boat. In regards to the Q and A on night driving, it seems as though the NPS will not allow night driving during the sea turtle nesting season. Why? There has never been an issue until the CD with effects of night driving on nesting sea turtles therefore mitigation of these effects are not required. The application of red tape over headlights is one way to mitigate the effects night driving may have on nesting sea turtles. Another mitigation technique would be the allowance of a park and stay option at Cape Point in Buxton and at South Point on Ocracoke Island. I understand the park service has denied both of these requests, but this should be revisited, given the exceptional recreational activities at these two locations and the safety factor a vehicle provides. "Without more data, that allow for an analysis between variables potentially effecting sea turtle nesting behavior, it is not possible to definitively identify the effects that vehicles have on nesting sea turtle behavior." Conference Review of Biological Opinion IMS 08/14/2006. So the NPS has no idea what effects, if any, vehicles have on sea turtles, qualitatively or quantitatively, yet the NPS chooses to ban night driving. Again I feel the public is being unnecessarily burdened because the NPS chooses to cater to the environmental groups. Furthermore from the same Conference Review "The full extent to which night time beach use by humans at CAHA may affect sea turtles and their nesting habitat is not known." So the science clearly states NPS has no idea and yet again, night driving is banned during the nesting season for no reason and unnecessarily restricts the public's access. The Proposed Rule states "This rule will not have an effect of \$100 mil or more on the economy." The economies of the affected area are not all that big to begin with. Almost 100% of the businesses are small businesses, and the effects of this proposed rule will have dire economic consequences to the businesses contained within CHNSRA. The study done by RTI was not even available upon the release of the DEIS or the FEIS. This is unacceptable. The NPS lends no weight to the people of CHNSRA, and for them to say "You are young enough to learn and earn a new living" Cyndi Holda (NPS) to Bob Eakes (resident and business owner of CHNSRA), is indicative of the total disregard for the people who make their home within CHNSRA. The study done by RTI was also done post CD and is flawed just on that one aspect alone and should be discarded. The Outer Banks Chamber of Commerce has a more accurate and detailed description of the economic hardships the CD has brought on the residents and economy of Dare and Hyde counties, and the Proposed Rule as written will have even further economic disaster than the CD. The NPS should lend more weight to the people affected by this proposed rule. The final version of the RTI Benefit-Cost analysis is deficient and limited by its own admission, only a 47% response rate of a small and biased sample population. Again the NPS is going ahead with total disregard of the people they are supposed to be serving. The Proposed Rule states "OMB has determined this rule raises novel legal or policy issues." In my estimation, this proposed rule as currently written should be thrown out and started over again, given the fact that it is written without the enabling legislation in mind. It is written as though to turn CHNSRA into a NWR, when it is clear how congress intended the area to be administered. Not only that, but in the DEIS, and the FEIS the area is not referred to as it should. It is the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, yet the recreational area is left out? Why? The full name is required by congress to be stated in "formal memorandum". The proposed rule states "The DOI certifies this document will not have a significant economic effect on a substantial number of small entities under the RFA." This is an outright lie. Almost 100% of the businesses are "small entities", and the Benefit-Cost Analysis is flawed in that it was conducted post CD and lends no weight to the economics prevailing pre-CD. This needs to be addressed. I would also like to see a percentage of the economy effected, not just an arbitrary number thrown into the air. The proposed rule states "While close to 100% of the rule's impacts would fall on small businesses, some popular areas, such as Cape Point, South Point, and Bodie Island Spit, would have designated year round or seasonal ORV routes. The presence of more VFA for pedestrians, combined with increased parking for pedestrian access, could increase overall visitation and thereby help businesses to recoup some of the revenues lost as a result of ORV restrictions." The use of the word "could" is a fallacy. Even if the implementation of VFA and parking does increase overall visitation, the lost revenue by ORV restrictions would overshadow the "possibility" of an increase in overall visitation, not to mention the fact that even with these VFA, there would be vast amounts of beach closures, possibly to include the VFA and areas around possible new parking areas and beach access ramps. The NPS can build all the parking areas and access ramps it wants, but if the beach beyond those newly constructed areas is closed, the argument is a non-starter. The proposed rule states, "the proposed rule indicates a number of measures designed to mitigate effect on the number of visitors as well as the potential for indirect economic effects on village businesses that profit from patronage by Seashore visitors using ORV. These include new pedestrian and ORV beach access points, parking areas, pedestrian trails, routes between dunes, and ORV ramps to enhance ORV and pedestrian access, a designated year round ORV route at Cape Point and South Point, subject to resource closures when breeding occurs, and pedestrian shoreline access along ocean and inlets shorelines adjacent to shorebird pre-nesting areas until breeding activity is observed." The NPS can build all the access ramps, trails, and parking areas it wants, but if the beach is closed beyond those areas all that work would be done in vain. It is akin to a bridge to nowhere. The NPS fails to realize the recreational and economic dynamics of CHNSRA, and again is pandering to the environmental groups. The proposed rule states, "In addition, we will seek funding for an alternative transportation study and consider applications for businesses to offer beach and water shuttle services. These extra efforts to increase overall access and visitor use under the selected action, which we developed with extensive public involvement, should increase the probability that the economic impacts are on the low rather than high end of the range." This is another slap in the face of the residents of CHNSRA. Part of the charm of CHNSRA used to be the opportunity to seek out areas on your own, selecting the appropriate choice based on one's desired experience. The water taxi/shuttle idea will turn the area into one that the NPS delegates where one can go and where one cannot go. The NPS again fails to realize the area was created for recreation, not guided tours of the area showing people 10% of what CHNSRA used to offer or used to be like. It is deplorable that the NPS thinks it has done the economy justice by the little efforts utilized to "minimize economic impacts". Regarding the UMRA (Unfunded Mandate Reform Act), if the NPS cannot even finish the Bodie Island lighthouse restoration, and has an unfunded backlog of maintenance projects to the tune of \$8 billion, how can it fund the improvements and construction contained in the FEIS and proposed rule? It is my feeling the NPS should not implement the rule until all construction and infrastructure is in place and funding approved. In regards to the PRA (Paperwork Reduction Act), the

DEIS and FEIS are well over 700 pages long. Is this meant to be a joke, because reading and commenting on each was a task that took a substantial amount of time, and I take the management of CHNSRA very seriously. Regarding the permitting process for obtaining an ORV permit the NPS again has unreasonably put the costs of implementing the proposed rule on the backs of ORV users. This is extremely unfair and biased as pedestrians compromise the bulk of resource violations. I feel as though the burden should be shared by all users of the park, not just ORV users. There are very few ways of getting to CHNSRA, therefore gates should be installed and everyone required to pay a fee to utilize the resource, not solely ORV users. The NPS also lends no weight to the permitting process and its effect on the local economy and has no idea what the costs, direct or indirect, will have on visitation and visitor experience. Does it say where this process is to take place, the time involved, and the manner in which the administration of the education is to take place? Even Judge Terrance Boyle in the CD hearing recognized that the permitting process will limit the amount of ORV use. The NPS lends no weight to this fact and needs to qualify and quantify the effects in full before the implementation of the ORV permitting process. This uncertainty will have an adverse effect on the local economy and the NPS should qualify and quantify the effects before the possibility of a permitting process can take place. From a common sense standpoint, the NPS wants me to pay to use even less beach than before? This makes no sense from a user standpoint. In conclusion, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed rule governing ORV use at CHNSRA. Please go back to the IMS and the appropriate balance of resource protection and recreation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13585    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** OMB's economic impact requirement of \$100 million is not a fair measurement for this area. This is a wilderness area with a sparse population in just a few villages. The economic base is very small, supplemented by the tourists who visit only during a short period of time during the calendar year. The measurement of a particular rule's economic impact should be scaled based on the area to which the proposed rule will apply. The expansion of Vehicle Free Areas will result in fewer ORV users. In an economy that is very small, that will have a large negative effect.

The promise to improve pedestrian access, provide improved parking area and make other improvements as offsets to increased Vehicle Free Areas will cost taxpayers money. The shoreline is many feet away from the current roadway, NC Rt.12. The establishment and construction of these amenities will disturb and likely destroy some of the same habitat and resources the VFAs are supposed to protect. Any improvement of the amenities should include the "primitive" campgrounds already established by the NPS. These campgrounds have been continually underfunded through the years and need to be brought up to the standards of NPS campgrounds in other national parks.

In my opinion, the establishment and increase of Vehicle Free Areas benefits a particular user group, pedestrians, to the detriment of another user group, ORV owners. It is not a fair rule that establishes such benefits.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13586    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Support a regulation to manage ORV use within Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The regulation should include science-based protections for wildlife and vehicle-free areas for wildlife and pedestrians

Birds and other wildlife that depend on seashore areas for resting, feeding and reproducing are limited to such areas; ORV users are not. I feel that the needs of these animals and birds should take precedence over ORV users who are seeking increased areas for recreation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13587    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The beach should remain natural - 80% of the coast has already been sacrificed for greedy development so people can foolishly live right on the beach.

Birds are easily disturbed and nest sites are not easily recognizable.

Rope off all sensitive areas.

Leave the beach to the critters that depend on it for survival - Off-road vehicles and their drivers don't need to get their kicks ripping up the beach.

Thank you, Diane Galvin

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13588    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As a long time visitor of the outer banks I have felt the slow pull of government regulations pulling our beach access rights

away. I travel up and down the National Seashore all year round and feel a great sense of pride that North Carolina has such a wonderful treasure that everyone is able to enjoy. As a recreational fisherman I would hate to lose access to some of the best surf fishing on the East coast. This does not only affect myself but all of the tourists dollars that flow up and down the islands. I understand the need to protect the wildlife but most of the individuals that use these beaches are very responsible and caring of these areas. Limiting the access to these areas is not the answer. Please do not take these very special places away instead I urge you to allow them to be shared for years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13589    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As a user of Hatteras National Seashore I do not want to see excessive or limiting regulations passed that would prohibit use of ORV on the seashore. Many responsible groups have commented and I have analyzed the brief. If passed, the access to the coast would be severely restricted and usage for surf fishing and movement on the coast would negatively impacted by the same people who fight so hard to conserve the same area with patronage and upkeep. It seems very unfair and restrictive to limit usage of the beaches to the very people who are most active in its preservation.

Thanks, David Blackshear Nashville, NC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13590    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras Regulations

How can idiots tearing up sand and everything else on the beach be considered more important than people and nature!!! It is NOT their constitutional right. Motorized sports belong in a separate place where they cannot destroy nature.

Marietta Smith

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13591    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I vacation to the shore once a year with my family, so this matter is personal to me. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. My family and I greatly enjoy watching for them when we visit, and not watching for vehicles. Small children should not have to watch out for anything other than nature, not vehicles. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13592    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow vehicles on beaches where endangered or protected species such as sea turtles and birds are trying to live their lives and raise the next generation. The damage done by these vehicles can be devastating to these species whom we should be protecting as best we can, to ensure that they still exist for our children and our children's children to observe, learn about, and enjoy.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13593    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off Road Vehicles are DESTROYING Cape Hatteras National Seashore, destroying wildlife, and endangering the MAJORITY of citizens who use the seashore.

These vehicles must be removed and restricted from larger portions of Cape Hatteras Seashore to protect the wildlife and human visitors.

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13594	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	This area of North Carolina was designated as a National Seashore Recreation area and should be administered by the original legislation. This is another example of Government and it's lock-step environmental partners completely out of control! Any government official that thinks this is a good thing for the people needs to leave this country and live in an authoritarian type country. Oh, that's what this country is becoming.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13595	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have been visiting the Outer Banks of North Carolina for over 40 years. My family bought a small single family residence in the Village of Avon nearly 30 years ago and when my Dad retired he lived there until he passed away in 1995. I still own this property and hope to retire there myself. I want to preserve the experiences that I have enjoyed my entire life for my grandchildren and others to enjoy. I have watched with concern and dismay as the National Park Service has responded to the unfounded lawsuits by the Defenders of Wildlife and the National Audubon Society, with misguided rules and proposals that are based largely on information taken out of context and in many cases just bad science. These worthy organizations are well funded and powerful, but mis-guided in this case. I wonder how many of the people behind these actions have actually been to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, or have even a perfunctory understanding of this environment and it's history. I am all for saving birds and all other wildlife, but it seems to me that this is a case of "throwing out the baby with the bathwater". In a reactionary approach to appease these powerful and influential organizations, the National Park Service has chosen to tread over the citizens of North Carolina's Outer Banks and all Freedom Loving citizens of America, because they offer less resistance and political power. That may prove to be a mistake. The Park Service is a management agency, not a law making agency. Even though the congress empowered them to "manage" public lands it did not give them the power to change public lands intended purpose. Their proposal, if enacted will have the end effect of changing the use and accessibility to the national Seashore as described when the park was established in 1937, and which has continually been reinforced by congress and Presidential order. This is wrong!						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13596	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a nationally significant resource that not only protects habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represents one of the last places where Americans can visit wild beach environments.						
	I am very concerned about the impacts of ORV use on wildlife and other recreationists. Please continue ORV buffer zones as in recent years. They clearly have benefitted wildlife.						
	In addition, please increase the miles of beach that are ORV-free in order to provide a fairer balance for those of us who want to be away from machines and experience the wilderness national parklands should offer.						
	Thank you for the opportunity to comment.						
<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13597	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						
	The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.						
	Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.						
	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the						

beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13598    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13599    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a comeback. As an active member of the Audubon Society Endangered Species Task Force, I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. Regulations must manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for these uses.

As a long time Block Island resident, I see that regulation will only protect if it mandates specific, science-based protections. Examples are non-driving buffers around nests, clear signage, and active interns. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

While you are at it, your regulations on Block Island should also be strengthened. Make our Town Council feel guilty about allowing vehicles, during prime breeding season, on the major beaches. The approval for any federally regulated activities should include all issues regarding threatened and endangered species.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13600    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13601    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do NOT allow the vehicles in the nesting areas. I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. If you allow the vehicles the nesting areas will suffer and the birds/wildlife will be gone forever. When is it enough? Haven't we destroyed enough of our natural areas? Please say NO to the vehicles. Thank you, Joanne Rist 609-489-0199

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13602    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. Please do NOT EVER allow any vehicles in the wildlife nesting areas. We have destroyed enough of our wildlife habitat. We just have to say NO to the vehicles. Thank you for your consideration Mark Rist 609-489-0199

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13603    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. Please say NO to any vehicles in the wildlife sensitive areas. We need to protect NOT destroy any more natural habitat. Please say NO to the vehicles. Thanks Joanne Rist 609-489-0199

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13604    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect our wildlife!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13605    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I first want to make the observation that much of this regulation is an enhancement of the Consent Decree, adding new "Species Management Areas," and various ramps and vehicle free areas along with continued resource buffers based on Consent Decree practices and protocols.

The Consent Decree was the result of a lawsuit filed by certain members of the Negotiated Rulemaking committee (which you sponsored), who had agreed to not sue in order to participate in the process. Subsequently, you allowed the plaintiffs to remain on the Negotiated Rulemaking committee, and unsurprisingly the plaintiffs, having no need to negotiate anything (having attained their goals via litigation), ensured that the committee produced nothing.

Thus, you are using as a basis for running CAHA, a lawsuit arising from the violation of an oath taken by interest groups whom you then allowed to continue to serve on a rulemaking committee in spite of your own rules that prohibited them from serving. As such the underlying structure of this regulation is based on deceit and use of the court to steamroll a particular and undemocratic viewpoint. This regulation is a tip of the hat to what happened, and on that basis alone it needs to be discarded, and Alternative A, the Interim Plan, adopted.

There are more reasons Alternative A should be adopted.

As part of legitimate rulemaking, the radii you are using for the various bird protection areas need to be publicly examined with respect to the scientific methods regarding their origination, as well as the legitimacy of the peer review processes that have been put forth in their defense. You have been made aware many times over of general dissatisfaction on both accounts by people with sufficient credentials to oblige you to take notice. These perceptions, shared by the residents and Seashore visitors, are only enhanced when news stories appear regarding the successful breeding of, for example plovers, mere yards away from human activity. Additionally, many people have been and continue to suffer financially due to the application of rules based on what is viewed as questionable, and possibly corrupted, science. Their suffering is compounded with aggravation by the knowledge that these buffers are the more restrictive than any other area on the east coast. Yet you not only use the protocols, but now propose to close entire areas throughout late spring and summer based on their recent use. You have no remotely agreed upon scientific basis here. You need to return to Alternative A.

Next, especially given the absolute failure of the Negotiated Rulemaking committee, I believe you have no legitimate basis for creating the vehicle free areas along with the required parking and ramp infrastructure. You certainly can't afford it, and neither can the American taxpayer. Further, you propose radically changing the nature of CAHA by implementing an as yet unspecified fee for vehicle access. You expect this ORV permit to pay for this infrastructure, and you expect to sell permits while clamping down access to a point where you will likely assure visitors holding these permits are turned away. I can't imagine a more poorly thought out plan to implement something that very, very few regular Seashore visitors would ever request, given the many areas that are vehicle free already (villages, Pea Island, jetties, behind the motels, etc). Again, Alternative A was addressing this need prior, and did so far more inexpensively and with far less disruption and dissatisfaction than what you are preparing to perpetrate on the public. You need to adopt Alternative A. Finally, many detailed comments have been very specific regarding the economic analysis you are putting forth via RTI. It has been demonstrated that you adopted this "rule" without even the benefit of a finalized cost analysis, and that the effects on the businesses and residents of Hatteras Island and Ocracoke have been minimized and effectively dismissed, most particularly by including in the analysis villages north of the Bonner Bridge. These combine to present an appearance of carelessness, and even arrogance, on your part. In fact, including villages north of the Bonner Bridge as part of the ROI is both arbitrary and capricious.

In summary, you are taking one of the best places in America and, based on an evolutionary process that began with a purposefully sabotaged Negotiated Rulemaking process, now intend to codify the Consent Decree practices. You are doing this with no recognized scientific underpinning, while adding unneeded and unrequested fees, infrastructure, and species management areas. You are thereby transforming CAHA into something much different and in fact nearly indistinguishable



from its rich and long established historical tradition. You propose to wantonly discard a tradition that is cherished by the many people who have made Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area either their home or vacation destination for many years. Given these underpinnings, this regulation is, literally and figuratively, built on sand. I urge you to rescind it and adopt Alternative A.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13606    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** ORV PERMITS... I don't like the idea of a permit to drive my ORV on the beach to surf fish. I do pay \$30 a year for saltwater license and if the ORV permit is \$30 to \$50, I can deal with it. This is in hoping the money remains at the beach to improve the beach facilities. ORV ROUTES... I do think that ORV Routes should be rerouted to accomodate the ever-changing sea shore, not just closed the ramp till another day. NIGHT DRIVING RESTRICTIONS... I've driven on the beach both day and night since the early 60's. The only turtle death incident I've heard of was last year while the night driving restrictions were in effect. I guest being a responsible driver doesn't mean much anymore. Punish the 99.9% of the law abiding citizens to cover for the 0.1% who really doesn't care.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13607    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13608    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The destructive use of our sand beaches for the benefit of irresponsible & selfish recreational drivers has reached a new high. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13609    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13610    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13611    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I am a surfer and I understand the joy of riding onto the outer banks. But,

I WOULD RATHER WALK TO THE SURF SPOTS AND HAVE MORE WILDLIFE AROUND! LET US NOT BE HOMOGENIC AND PROTECT THE OTHER LIVING THINGS AROUND US!

best regards,

Haley Saunders

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13612    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I sincerely request the defeat of this rule change for several reasons. I feel this is a move to eliminate all use of tax payer owned land by nature lovers and fisherman. For years I have enjoyed Portsmouth Island along with many from my church. The ban on ATV's is upsetting and unnecessary, and all additional regulations seem to be a monetary barrier for middle class enthusiast. I hope to enjoy Portsmouth with my son in a few years, but this rule will eventually lead to only allowing foot traffic.

I will do all I can to hold any and all who promote this rule change responsible when it comes to the polls.

Sadly it is the small business owners such as Morris Marina that will pay for these changes by driving them out of business. And for what? To silence a few environmental groups who do not even use and enjoy Portsmouth.

Chris Clontz

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13613    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am writing in regards to the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I enjoy off-roading myself and have witnessed first hand the destruction to nature in can cause. Unfortunately, many of my fellow off-road enthusiasts are extremely irresponsible when it comes to conservation. I have seen areas of incredible natural beauty be devastated in a matter of hours.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and

pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13614    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to oppose the allowance of off-road vehicles that can pose a threat to various types of wildlife. Restrictions should be imposed on the use of these vehicles, so that their impact will be limited.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13615    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. They should be severely restricted.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13616    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It is important to protect the natural habitat of the shoreline wildlife and humans can enjoy nature better on foot than on motorized vehicles that not only hurt the wildlife but damage the ecosystem.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13617    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** After reading the proposal I have the following comments:

1. Leave the ramps and ORV access as it had been before the consent decree. Mark the nest without extensively prohibiting human or ORV access. The buffer zones currently being used are far too large. The birds are not scared of humans or ORV's. In addition, the current method of marking distracts from the natural beauty of the island.
2. Move the turtle nest to areas that were not ORV access areas prior to the consent decree.
3. The test should be provided online. Software is available that ensures the test are administered and taken fairly.
4. The annual fee should be kept reasonable.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13618    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I have been fishing on the Outer Banks of North Carolina two to five times per year for over 30 years. Without a doubt, the beach access restrictions with which we have had to endure during the last few years and the limitation proposed in this rule should be considered criminal. Both the North Carolina representatives, the judicial and the National Park Service should be ashamed of themselves.

I understand that the Park Service was very irresponsible in not developing driving rules many years ago, and I understand that

there have been a few unfortunate accidents caused by drinking and irresponsible driving on the beach, but this rule is punishing the loyal fishermen and good residence of the outer banks -- especially those on Hatteras Island. I have not gone surf fishing on Hatteras Island in the last two years, because I cannot access the parts of the beach where I like to fish the most -- specifically Cape Point -- when the big fish are near the shore.

In the 30+ years that I have gone fishing, I have never hurt any bird or turtle, nor has anybody else that I know. The Park Service needs to develop reasonable driving rules without the unnecessary "whole-sale" access restriction. If you need to block off a small area around a turtle's or bird's nest -- fine -- but not entire sections of the beach. I feel like we are being held hostage by a few individuals with deep pockets that do not want any humans on the beach or at a minimum, want to limit access to a very few.

Keep in mind that Cape Point is a magical place for many, including many people unable to walk out that far from the access points. These people should not be prohibited to visit the point except during the colder winter months.

To restrict beach access based on a perceived increase in danger to the wildlife seems to me to be an unsubstantiated farce.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13619    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Sincerely,

David M. Pinckard

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13620    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE do what you can to keep these birds safe; take care of them, it's our responsibility

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13621    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13622    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The proposed regulations will cause much hardship to the local economy. ORV use of the beaches South of Salvo is the niche

that brings most of the visitors to Hatteras Don't destroy the livelihood of so many good people in the lower OBX. Permits are an idea that should stay up North with the Yankees!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13623    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I am an educator in Hampton Roads and I am also an avid bird watcher. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13624    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The natural beauty of Cape Hatteras is what draws people to the area. If my family and I visit we want to look forward to a serene setting where we can relax. If nesting areas are not protected eventually the wildlife will leave and/or disappear; and along with the disappearance of the wildlife will be the disappearance of tourist like myself and my family. The economy of Cape Hatteras can only flourish by attracting tourist who wish to have a peaceful and attractive place to relax and see the wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13625    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13626    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13627    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

I enjoy hiking, seeing wildlife, and being in the peace and quiet of nature, which is impossible with more than half of the seashore designated for off road vehicles.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13628	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am so tired of almost getting run over on the Outer Banks beaches. The tire tracks and oil seen everywhere makes the beach seem more like a highway. In the last few years I've spent all my tourism dollars in the mountains. It feels more like nature should be. Like the Outer Banks used to be years ago. Oh, and I really don't mind people who drink too much, but when they are driving on the beaches of OBX it's REALLY annoying and dangerous. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. Thank you for your time, eileen hoyt						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13629	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	There is no need for a new plan as management needs to be the focus, not restriction. I am a property owner and have been coming to HI for 25 years. All of us that fish these beaches are stewards of the environment and have never done anything to harm speices or the environment. Restricting access because of a nesting bird is insane. There are hundreds of acres of land on the shore where nesting birds can be moved to that would be better for them and keep them from natural predators. When you restrict access you deny access to our prized sea shore and cause economic hardship to businesses on the island. I don't understand this approach or policy other than to think it is easier to close the beaches because it's easier for you to manage.						

Requiring me to pay a fee to ride on a beach my taxes already pay for is insane as well. To pay to manage access. There is really nothing to manage is there?

Also, please stop killing animals for the sake of protecting the plover. This is the cycle of life. It's extremely sickening the way the NPS carries out this process. Killing for the sake of living. Rich to say the least.

In the end I think my comments may mean nothing as we have commented several times on this issue. I feel this is just a formality before the boom is lowered so to speak. hopefully in the end you will do the right thing and preserve access and a way of life. Hopefully more won't be forced to abandon their dreams because the NPS refuses to manage a situation properly. Hopefully... but I doubt it.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13630	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I object to the rules as being submitted for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area.						

This area was established as a "recreation area" not a "wildlife refuge. This was the contract the government made with the land owners when taking over the private property and turning it public. The government is breaking this contract. It should either comply, or return the land to the State of North Carolina and it's residents.

The very fact that this whole plan is referred to as an "ORV access plan" is itself a fraud. This plan bans and regulates all forms of access, ORV's, pedestrian, and from boats. It's not an "ORV plan", it's an "access limitation rule", because that's what it is really doing. And it's doing it in an area that was designated a "recreation area" that was designated by law passed by Congress to "be developed as needed for recreation". This a park, not a refuge, parks are for people, refuges are for wildlife. That doesn't mean one completely trumps the other, but rather dictates the primary purpose which should be achieved as much as possible. This common sense idea seems lost on the NPS. See we all aren't there to see the birds, many are there to see the ocean, the beach, the fishing, but get banned from that because a narrow minded few think it's all about birds and turtles.

There is plenty of room for both to coexist, but instead the rules proposed create massive closures that ban recreation from many of the best recreation places in the seashore. The 1000m closures are more extreme than than almost anywhere. The rules extend endangered species protections to birds that aren't even listed as endangered or threatened.

What the rules should be:

flexible and locally determined to enable a maximum amount of recreation, the original purpose of this park. Only protect species that truly need protection, not ones that special interest groups choose. permits should only be charged to provide money to the cost of the access

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13631    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Many years ago my husband and our small children spent our summers on Ocracoke Island where he was a seasonal park ranger with the National Seashore. During those years (1970-75) I marveled over and came to appreciate the teeming wildlife that make their home on our unique outer banks ocean shore. We humans have the rest of the islands and so much of the ocean front for our activities, and there are so many of us these days. But surely these sensitive areas along the Seashore that people of the Park Service KNOW need to be protected should be protected from heavy motor vehicles. You owe it to us citizens of this state - and all the states - to protect at least the little bit of this coastline for which the National Seashore has been set aside.

We come back to Ocracoke occasionally to visit, and of course we visit our own New Hanover County beaches. We live near a national treasure too precious to be damaged by the selfish wishes of a few who would crush the delicate seashore life under their wheels.

Earla Pope Wilmington NC

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13632    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please double check the science and you will see that it is all wrong. Night time driving was for False landings, but no different for the past three years in a effect. Massive closers for the piping plovers, but still same amount of success for the plovers. Even with the few birds produced for the past ten plus years, there is no improvement in nesting of more pairs of plovers. All that has been done, only hurting the fishing and other use for the beach has been done.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13633    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please act to avoid closing Cape Hatteras National Seashore to off road vehicles. Responsible use should be required, and perhaps a nominal fee to offset enforcement, but open access for sport and pleasure must be maintained. Special closures for nesting and other wildlife needs are obviously necessary, but as a senior citizens our only access to these natural wonders is via off road vehicle. Please do not deny this access.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13634    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** To Whom It May Concern: I am writing on the dismay of the proposed regulations set for the Cape Hatteras National Recreation Seashore, rule proposal 1024-AD85. I have attended regulation meetings over the years in Raleigh NC and still cannot believe the the NPS and DOI would go in a direction against the people who enjoy the beaches of Cape Hatteras and understand what is needed to protect and preserve access to the beach. ORV permits pricing for access to the Beaches are uncalled for at a recreation area. Some people save for years to visit the Seashore and to expect them to pay another fee to access the beaches is ridiculous. Especially when access to the beach is already unpredictable based on other extreme rulings to protect certain birds and sea turtles. The Designated routes for ORV use is extreme and close minded to make decisions on what parts of the beaches can be accessed. Cape Point and Hatteras Inlet are some of the mosts enjoyable areas to fish and shell. To limit access those areas without further consideration is unacceptable! How can the information used to make the decision on the FEIS be made with full cooperation amongst US Government departments. There are plenty of "protected" birds living on the island surrounding the Outer Banks, that are not put into the equation because the land is not "Park Service" land. To limit the view of just Park Land is an closed and biased view by the NPS and DOI. The NPS should reevaluate their decision for the

Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The area is a recreation area for the people and should not be limited by the government with out the full input of the people who enjoy the beach and live surrounding the area. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13635    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add regulations and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13636    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

Please don't change the regulations on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13637    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13638    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I am a 20 year visitor to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. My particular favorite activity is the world class surf fishing. I have been surf fishing since I was old enough to hold my own rod, starting at around the age of 4, and have fished the shoreline of our East Coast from the tip of the Florida Keys to the top of Maine and beyond to the tip of Nova Scotia, and I can honestly say that Hatteras is my favorite place on the entire East Coast. Being from Virginia, weekend trips have been many and my wife and I take a full two weeks a year in Hatteras Village, bringing with us a good bit of spending for the local economy. The fishing has been good at times lodging reasonable. But as of late these trips have been pared back with the unpredictability of beach closures. In the past the wildlife closures were reasonable and effective and I supported them. Recently I learned the proper name of the "Park" was the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area (CHNSRA). This implies to me that the mission was/is to provide beach and shoreline that is available to all in this country, specifically for recreational purposes. ORV access to remote areas always was understood not as only a privilege but a necessity. As of late, it appears to many people that there is a goal to severely restrict and potentially eliminate this form of access. I feel that this recent trend towards closures goes completely against the original intent of giving the NPS control over The Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The NPS was supposed to be stewards of this great resource, protecting it FOR the People of Hatteras, and all those that wanted to partake in its beauty. Not restrict access to it against the will of the people of that you purportedly serve.

This proposed rule appears to confirm that notion. I have followed and previously commented during this rulemaking process. I have seen many substantive comments brushed aside with mention of "best available science". I believe my National Park Service (NPS) has done a poor job in this rulemaking process. The NPS has used incomplete science and justification for the ORV restrictions we currently face and continues using it in the proposed restrictions. The most egregious being the current rules instituted by the now famous consent decree. This is policy making at its worst. The rules have been administered with zero public participation, touted as restrictions based on "best available science", and then wind up as the basis for all action



alternatives in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Is that how we develop and craft policy now?

The proposed rule continues the flawed process and it appears the NPS seeks to lock in bad policy making decisions. This rush to completion is unsettling and as stated in the preamble of the proposed rule, "OMB has determined that this rule raises novel and legal or policy issues.?" This leads me to believe the OMB questions many of the flaws in the rulemaking process, particularly the existing rules resulting from the consent decree.

Upon reading the proposed rule, I am at odds with much of it. The process that has resulted in this proposed rule is incomplete, weak, and should be redone. I am most at odds with the designated ORV routes, a permit system, and the night driving restriction.

The proposed routes refer to ramps and access points that do not currently exist. The proposed routes refer to interdunal roads that do not currently exist. There is mention within the proposed rule of parking lots that do not currently exist. How can these designated routes be based on the possibility that a ramp or parking lot is approved and built? In the meantime why are existing routes being taken away? These routes should be preserved until additional ramps and interdunal roads are in place. And why in the world could you possibly think that is could somehow be better to construct new roads, new parking lots and new access ramps in such a delicate environment, and close the ones that already are there, and are perfectly adequate?

I do not support a permit system unless it is free or of a very small administrative cost, and is readily available online with no limit on the number available. For newer beach drivers, educational materials could and should be made available. In-person educational requirements would be cumbersome at best. Not to mention, many beach drivers and locals in particular, are the most experienced there are anywhere in navigating the beach by vehicle. How insulting would it be for a Hatteras or Ocracoke Island native to be required to complete a beach driving course? If revenue is needed for the Recreational Area, maybe a toll booth would make more sense so that all visitors to the Recreational Area could share in providing revenue. Holding one segment of the visiting public responsible for upgrades such as those mentioned in the proposed routes section seems rather arbitrary and unfair.

The night driving restriction is also arbitrary. It is presumed that vehicles operating on the beach at night are having dire impacts on nesting sea turtles. The Park Service has still not been able to make this connection with their "best available science". Just because something sounds right, doesn't mean it is. There are actually plenty of other, well documented studies that show that night driving, and all driving for that matter is beneficial to the sea turtles and protected birds because the increased human activity scares away the predatory species, especially the feral cats, that do more to prey on what you are trying to protect than ORV traffic. Study after study has shown this. The night driving restrictions appear politically motivated and do not belong in this proposed rule.

Finally, because of Hurricane Irene, there have to be many, many people who likely planned to submit comment but may find it hard or impossible to meet the deadline. Please consider extending the comment period for an additional 30 days. And the last plea that I am going to make is for the people of Hatteras Island. The rules that you are proposing to put into place will do nothing but cripple an economy that is already on the edge of disaster. If you really think that a bunch of Birders and Kite Surfers are going to invest the money in the economy of all of the Villages of Hatteras Islands as the Fishing community has, you are very, very mistaken. This is a community that has always, and hopefully will continue to exist, primarily because of fishing, and all of the monetary benefits that brings with it. If you take that away from this Community, you will be sentencing it, and all of the people that live there, and the generations and history that came before, to almost certain death. If you do that to these proud people, who have persevered through some of the harshest conditions of any people in our country to carve out a life for themselves you will be doing not only them, but our entire country and our entire system a grave injustice.

In conclusion, I believe the proposed rule is merely continuation of bad policy making. It is part of a rush to put in place what should have been finalized long ago. Certainly there needs to be some final policy. But, the Park Service has warped, polluted, and stretched the public's trust in transparency during this rulemaking process long ago, and this proposed rule reflects that haphazard approach. I believe the Park Service should return to the Interim Management Strategy, and begin the process again of developing an ORV rule that is not so flawed.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13639	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am a resident of the Outer Banks of North Carolina, and I support a plan that provides adequate protection for threatened and endangered species first and foremost. You are mandated by law to provide protection and critical habitat for these species, not to provide off road vehicle access to ORV enthusiasts. The consent decree that has been in place in recent years has shown without a shadow of a doubt that protections from ORVs lead to increases in nesting success of threatened and endangered species of shorebirds and sea turtles. Cape Hatteras National Seashore was created under the premise of protecting our natural resources and to provide recreational opportunities for visitors. Nowhere does it state that these recreational opportunities must include offroad vehicle access. Many of us would rather visit a shoreline in a natural and pristine state devoid of off road vehicles.						

I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The

management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13640    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I do own an ORV & have rented homes on the Outer Banks that have required 4WD for as long as 20 miles or more to access & that's specifically why I rented those properties. Having said that, however, I do love, respect, & cherish nature & natural habitats. I believe & I'm hoping there would be some way to honor both sides of this issue. I believe that with the information & technology we have available to us today that there is a way to intertwine the ORV paths in harmony with the natural habitats that exist. I'm hoping & confident that both sides working together can come to a solution that can be enjoyed for many years to come.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13641    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As per the proposed Special Regulations, Areas of National Park System: Cape Hatteras National Seashore (Document ID NPS-2011-0005-0001), I have a few comments on a couple of the items discussed.

As it states, there will be a 7-day/annual permit required to use an "approved" ORV on the seashore. It states the cost will be based on a "cost recovery system"? And on top of that, the driver must have passed a "short term education program". - As I live in Virginia, I used to visit the eastern shore of Ocean City, Md. and take our ORV to do fishing from the seashore. I have lost interest in this "controlled" recreation do to the enormous fees. Cape Hatteras was a godsend. What does this "short term education program" cost and does it supersede the valid Driver's License?

With this fee for the ORV Permit, routes still cannot be guaranteed accessible. How can you charge someone for something you can't guarantee they can even use?

A mobility impaired person can get a special permit, so that they may be able to be dropped off at a location at the seashore but the vehicle must promptly leave the area after that person exits the vehicle. It does state that this will be a "case-by-case basis". Who determines this, the person's physician or a NPS employee? It seems a little questionable of how a NPS employee can supersede a physician on a "mobility impaired person".

It is correct in saying that the 100% of this rule will impact the small business in the villages. But with the Presence of more VFAs for the pedestrians and increased parking could increase visitation and help businesses recoup". Are these parking areas going to be asphalt free? If not, wouldn't that cause more damage to the habitat, destroying natural areas, oil residue from vehicles and pedestrian waste? If this plan passes, it will destroy the basis of recreation for a multitude of individuals. Preserve and protect...NOT PROHIBIT. Do not make another Assateague Island, please.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13642    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** My family and I have been coming to the Outer Banks for 5 years now, and we very much enjoy being able to drive on the beach and go surf fishing. I understand you need to protect the wildlife, but isnt that why there is the Pea Island refuge area? If you stop The ORV access the local businesses and familys will suffer, just as it has over the years as more closures are put up. Poeple will eventually get fed up and stop vacationing in the OBX. As for the permits, i can see paying \$10 for a 10 day pass like the fishing liscense is but thats about it. We love coming to the OBX every year, sometimes 2 or 3 times a year, but if things get much worse we will be finding other places to go. ORV access has been part of the OBX for a long time, and it should stay that way. If you want to be on a beach with no vehicles then go to VA beach or Myrtle beach. Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13643    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The Cape Hatteras national Seashore is one of the most beautiful parts of our national park system and must be protected at all costs.

When one segment of the environment is compromised the whole system of preservation falls short.

I would like to see all the national parks returned to the pre - 1960 era of environment and health precautions.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13644    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The NPS decision to implement plan F is a capitulation to the litigants who made Reg-Neg fail and are intent on changing the National Seashore to a wildlife refuge. Plan F will implement a fee system in which the only payees will be visitors who use ORV's to access the beach. In reality to close areas to ORV's is to effectively close them to all as there are few public parking areas or boardwalks to cross dunes. To base the cost of an ORV permit on "cost recovery" to construct parking ect. is unjust. The same parties that sued to block access will no doubt sue to block construction of hardened structures (such as parking lots). The reality is that ORV's are the lowest "footprint" way to access the CHNRS. If the NPS were to set up a gate at the entrance to the park by the Manteo Causeway and charge all entrants a fee that would be fair, but it would certainly deny the intent of a "free national seashore" as well as creating monumental traffic jams. The proposed "mandatory" classes at NPS offices for ORV "driver education" are sure to do the same.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13645    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13646    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13647    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13648    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The beach is for animals and humans. Keep the vehicles off.Want to drive on the beach go to Daytona. It's dead already.

**Correspondence ID:** 13649    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** First, enabling legislation and establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area assured beach access to the public - residents and visitors alike. This area was developed as a recreational area - not a wildlife area. Continued public access, including ORV access, should be the primary consideration in developing an ORV plan, as promised many years ago to the residents of the Outer Banks whose livelihood depends it. I fully understand that some form of management is going to result, but it should be absolutely the least necessary based upon all factors involved. A simple comparison of cost versus benefit should be sufficient to adopt a minimalist posture on restricting access when factors such as the following are considered: 1) the biggest threat to fledgling birds are natural events - storm and tidal overwash, predation, etc - not ORV use or public access. In fact, fledging success has declined in the two years of ORV closures; 2) the most important public access areas should remain open absent extremely compelling circumstances - areas such as Cape Point, Hatteras Inlet beach, Ocracoke Inlet beach; the benefit has not been shown to exist in two years of closures versus the cost to the public and the economy. Areas closed to accommodate unfledged chicks have been overly large to the detriment of public access. Similarly, areas closed to turtle nests should be even easier to manage, since turtle eggs have a very specific gestation period. A simple closing of the nest site (a very small area) fully protects the nest; then a few days before the gestation period ends the pathway to the ocean can be closed and prepared for the turtle walk. Night ORV use has not been demonstrated to have a detrimental impact and should not be included in the restrictions. I oppose permits, but if implemented they should be readily available and minimal in cost. Revenue can be used for personnel needed for better beach monitoring needed for minimal regs on ORVs

**Correspondence ID:** 13650    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13651    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** For many generations, our family has utilized the beaches of the outerbanks for fishing, surfing and recreation. We have spent thousands of hours in these areas over the last forty years as well as thousands of dollars in the local economy. Please do not limit our access to these areas. I was raised on these beaches with my father and my younger children are just beginning to have the same experiences as I did. Please do not limit our access. There are many recreation areas that cannot be reasonably accessed by foot. Putting limitations will not allow our future generations to experience the beauty that we have enjoyed for many years.

**Correspondence ID:** 13652    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Stop the killing of our wildlife

**Correspondence ID:** 13653    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include

specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13654	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13655	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	All of these comments pertain to 7.58: C.2.(v) How long will the 'short education program' take to complete? When will the program be available? Why must the applicant appear in person? Why couldn't the program be available over the Internet to make the process more effective. Then any inspections could be performed very quickly allowing the applicant to be on his way. c.7.(ii) Thank you for recognizing pre-existing fishing tournaments and allowing their special use. c.2. I am exceedingly concerned about the cost of the access permits. The fees are to be established to cover NPS administrative costs but I am concerned that those costs could be extremely high due to the significant amount of manpower and equipment that will be necessary to enforce this plan often times 24x7. It's a blank check for the NPS. Fees will be set at NPS costs but NPS will determine what those costs are with no input from other stakeholders. c.10. Mentions methods for posting closures in 1.7(a) but I do not find that section in the Federal Register posting. I would hope that via Internet would be one mechanism. c.13. I am concerned about the allowance of only a limited number of vehicles in a given ORV route. This is overly restrictive and assumes an overly worse case scenario in that all vehicles in that particular route will be moving at a given time. This will severely limit the number of users at any given time. Mobile fisherman are driven by the fish bit. When the bit is on, fisherman will appear in numbers. This will create long access lines waiting for someone to leave the beach. This will be exceedingly unfair to non-locals who may have scheduled vacation in advance and then when they get to Hatteras, not be allowed to access the beach with their vehicles. This is too restrictive and effectively serves the same role as limiting the number of permits to be issued. Why have a permit if you can't use it. Generic - limiting comments to 2k characters is too restrictive.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13656	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13657	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I would like to express my concerns to the limitations of the ORV plan. I for one would like continue to enjoy our countries most beautiful gifts. With the current limitations, I fear that future regulations would restrict us from ever enjoying what I love so dearly. I want future generations to enjoy what I have so freely enjoyed for most of my life. I want to be able to fish with my grand children. This will not only affect fisherman, but vacationers as well. There is absolutely no reason we cant come to a fair and responsible solution. I want nothing more than to take care of this resource. Please take into consideration that we as American citizens should have the freedom to enjoy our country and all of it's resources. It's up to you to make the right choice. Next time it could be something you love dearly!!

**Correspondence ID:** 13658    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

**Correspondence ID:** 13659    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** would like to see orv permitted on the north and south cores banks cape lookout. i know there are a few bad apples out there but some of us out here really love and respect that small peice of paradise. not only do i enjoy the park but it would hurt alot of businesses that relay on these places being open to the public and there vehicles. my thoughts on the islands are always to leave it beeter than when i came on it. thanks for anything you can do to keep this privelege open for the public to enjoy. thanks scott

**Correspondence ID:** 13660    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

**Correspondence ID:** 13661    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the current state of our earth. Did you know that three species go extinct every hour, and that we are in the midst of an extinction greater in magnitude than the one that wiped out the dinosaurs? It is absolutely imperative that we do everything we can to save each and every species we possibly can. In a position of power, you have the ability to make the difference that we can only beg of you. Please revise the ORV regulations to offer maximum protection for threatened species like piping plovers and sea turtles. Thank you!

Sincerely, Jenna Parker

**Correspondence ID:** 13662    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** The orv rules have done great damage to the economy on the outer banks. This country needs jobs and the orv rules hurt the businesses on and around the outer banks. I am not against protecting the wildlife on our coast, but the off road vehicles are not responsible for any wildlife damage, nature itself is mostly responsible. the audubon society and other wildlife "protectors" just want no one to be able to enjoy our beautiful coastline, mostly the people that drive on the beach are responsible, nature loving people and they take care of the beach they drive on. Personally the groups that are trying to remove us from driving on the beach whenever we choose spout lies to get their agenda accomplished.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13663      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I will make a brief comment; many others have expressed extensive and detailed comments on the Proposed Rule, one of the most accurate and detailed being NPS-2011-0005-0213.

I have been an annual visitor to the Outer Banks since 1971. My family vacationed there several times a year for 30 years and I have been taking my family there since 2000. Few people have a greater love of Hatteras Island than I do. I do not feel the Proposed Rule is in the best interest of Hatteras Island, the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area, or the people of Dare and Hyde Counties.

My concern with the Proposed Rule is that it has not been thoroughly reviewed and investigated by the appropriate people. Well-financed special interest groups with an inordinate amount of influence have managed to skew the debate. Actual facts on the impact of ORVs on the natural habitat have not been examined. The interests and desires of the citizens of Dare and Hyde counties have not been heard (or not been listened to). The implementation of the Proposed Rule has obviously not been planned or funded.

The Proposed Rule has become another tool for environmental extremists to use to block the American public from using areas in the name of protecting a habitat or species, but they are doing this without any structured analysis or actual evidence to back up their contentions.

I hope the OMB staffers and decision-makers responsible for the Proposed Rule will delay action until they can fully investigate the implications of this action and the requirements to implement it. Please listen to all sides of the argument and do not let special interest groups with little knowledge of the area or interest in its ultimate destiny sway the outcome.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13664      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

The National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing off-road vehicle use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore (CHNS) troubles me greatly.

Protected wildlife has made great progress under the current temporary plan. The number of sea turtle nests rose over 86%, from 82 in 2007 to 153 in 2010. The number of shorebirds is also rising.

The proposed Park Service plan reduces the protections provided by the temporary plan. If the proposed plan is implemented, the gains of the past three years will be lost.

Please revise the proposed plan so that it includes, at a minimum, the same level of wildlife protection as the temporary plan.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13665      **Project:** 10641      **Document:** 41993      **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13666    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I have visited the National Seashore several times and have found it blessedly free of the intensive ORV use and activity that is carried on along the rest of the Outer Banks. Under current management, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have been able to make a comeback - such species as the least tern, black skimmer and piping plover have enjoyed increased nesting success. However the proposed management plan treats protection of wildlife resources as optional and provides few areas for families to enjoy vehicle-free beaches. The plan sets aside only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use. More vehicle-free areas are needed for both wildlife and pedestrians. The new management plan should: - include enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrian users - set aside additional areas for those uses - add buffers and other wildlife protections As I have said, the National Seashore is the one area along the Outer Banks where visitors can enjoy the peace and majesty of the undisturbed ocean shore. This experience is rare and valuable! The Seashore is also a place where nesting habitat for beach-nesting birds and sea turtles should be preserved. I urge you to regulate ORV use to maximize wildlife protection and pedestrian opportunities. Thank you. I

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13667    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

I really think ORV use in a wildlife area is not necessary. People need to be made aware of environmental and wildlife concerns when using these vehicles. They are totally outrated and too noisy for a beach area where one might just like to let your mind rest while doing a morning stroll. Please just ban them. They are fine for a country road or other place where animals and people will not be affected. Please look into the horrible way people use these vehicles and see if something can be done to limit their use on beaches in particular. Maybe just restricting them during nesting times would be the solution. I beg you in the name of my sanity to end the uncontrolled use of these noisy, awfully dangerous vehicles anywhere in the country, especially on beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13668    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am a fisherman and environmental scientist from Mount Airy, MD. In years past, I have traveled to the beaches of Hatteras Island up to 8 times a year and spent approximately 2 weeks of my year in hotels and rental houses on those beaches. While there I like to use my vehicle to access some of the best surf fishing spots in the world and relaxing on the beach with my wife and family. Due to the loss of beach access on Hatteras Island over the last few years, we have started exploring other beaches in South Carolina, Maryland, and Delaware and no longer consider the Outer Banks our only vacation destination. It is a difficult decision to make, but when our reason for visiting is taken away from us we are forced to find new places to spend our vacation.

I truly hope that you take the time to consider the attached comments.



Although the Final Rule is very long and detailed, I have taken as much time as I can to read through it. I would like to offer the following comments and hope for their consideration in the development of the final plan.

- Given the current damage caused by Hurricane Irene, I believe that many Hatteras Island residents will be unable to submit their comments by the September 6, 2011 deadline.

- As a member of the North Carolina Beach Buggy Association, I have read through the organization's stance and I agree with the comments put forth by the Coalition for Beach Access.

- I believe that decreasing the amount of beach available to OSV users will have a negative economic impact on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands

- I believe that the negative economic impact felt by Hatteras Island businesses as a result of the new driving restrictions has been understated

- I believe that the economic impacts on the villages within the seashore on Hatteras and Ocracoke Island will be severe and have been understated throughout this process. Beaches not governed by the NPS on Bodie Island, beaches further south, such as Topsail or Myrtle Beach, and northern beaches in Maryland and Delaware, will represent a more desirable alternative to the visitor who would normally chose Hatteras Island beaches like Rodanthe or Frisco. While the overall impact on the "Region of Influence" may be minimal, impacts to small businesses in Waves, Buxton, and Hatteras will be extreme.

- Although the economic impact of lost visitors during the summer months may be tolerable on the Island, but the impact during the spring and fall will be devastating to some businesses. The money made by Hatteras Island businesses during the spring and fall seasons helps them to survive the slow time over the winter months. The customers who support these businesses in the off season are FISHERMEN. When access to some of the best fishing spots on the East Coast is lost, fishermen will stop coming. Any plan which fails to account for the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars of seasonal income from these fishermen because of lost access is inadequate.

- I believe that adding new access ramps as described in the plan will allow access to more of the beach for OSV users and will minimize the negative impact of resource closures on the experience of visitors. However, until these access ramps are built and funding for their maintenance is secured, they cannot be relied upon as part of this plan.

- I believe that intradunal roads will increase the amount of beach available to OSV users will further minimize the negative impact of resource closures on the experience of visitors.

- I believe that intradunal roads should be exempt from buffers for nesting because dunes represent a barrier which is both impassable to unfledged chicks and sufficient to prevent disturbance to wildlife.

- The implementation of 1000 meter buffers for unfledged plovers is based solely upon the Consent Decree which was forced upon the National Park Service and user groups by court action. No scientific research exists supporting the establishment of a 1000 meter buffer as a minimum distance. The science that this plan is based upon should be peer reviewed not a holdover from a previous plan.

- I believe that responsible beach driving by OSV users is best ensured by a permitting process with stiff penalties for misuse of the beach or damage to resource closures, but arbitrary expansions for violations of enclosures only hurts those who respect the beach. Violators will continue to break laws and ruin the experience of others unless there is vigilant enforcement of the laws.

- I believe that suitable habitat such as spoil islands which are not part of the Seashore proper should be incorporated into the overall management plan for the protection of wildlife in the seashore. Success by shorebirds in habitats just outside the National Seashore should be recognized by the NPS not discounted.

- Any permit system included in this rule should be free or of little cost. Instructional classes or training associated with the permitting should be minimal.

- I believe that the night driving ban is excessive and there should be more flexibility given to the NPS to allow the beach to be opened earlier in the year. This year is a good example of why this would be valuable. Overwash from the recent hurricane likely destroyed some remaining nests on the oceanfront beaches, it would be preferable if the Park Service had the flexibility to open the beaches, or at least those with no nesting activity, to night driving before September 15, 2011.

Thanks CJ Schleicher

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13669	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,06,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						

**Correspondence:** I oppose this proposed plan because it is draconian and not supported by SOUND SCIENCE. There is no beach driving allowed from South of Oregon Inlet to Rodanthe, and I have not seen any evidence that beach driving causes any environmental issues in allowed areas versus this restricted area. I think that as a taxpaying citizen I am being denied my right to free access to the beaches as the Cape Hatteras Seashore was created to provide. I oppose a permitting process as just another tax on top of what I am paying already. These beach closures are not in the spirit of what the Seashore was created for. You have let several environmental groups, and a bunch of lawyers come in and deny us access to the beaches through litigation and bogus science. These closures are not only so draconian that they not only have disrupted people's access to the seashore for all types of recreation but have also have caused untold economic hardships on the island's businesses and residents. There needs to be more middle ground and REAL input into what goes on in the way of rulemaking. Local government needs more input as do the effected stakeholders on the beach. I think way too much credence is placed on what the environmental hired guns want and demand and not what is really beneficial to ALL of the users. Therefore I oppose this proposed rules because of the above reasons.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13670    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I find the proposed rule for governing the areas of the National Park System of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore to be severely lacking in evidence to justify such closures. The majority of people who seek to use the Cape Hatteras National Seashore with their ORV are responsible individuals who understand the delicate balance of the areas in which they are traveling. It's this being about in nature that draws many of us to the area in the first place. Many of us feel our voices and opinions are being drowned out by those of special interest groups who for the most part really aren't users of the area in question. There seems to be almost no concern for how this will affect the lives of those who enjoy this natural spectacle. Visitors come from all over the country to enjoy the seashore with their ORVs. These visitors bring in revenue that stimulates the local economy and allows a unique American culture to continue to exist much the way it has for many years. However, with these extensive closures (seasonal, area-based, etc) we will see a steady decline in these visitors. For what? Can someone tell me what evidence the aggrieved parties have against the ORV community that has necessitated such drastic measures. It's been a long time since I've seen such a measure that affects the lives of so many being decided upon by the uninformed opinions of such a few. It seems an American injustice of epic proportions.

I've been going the Hatteras National Seashore for many years now, and I hope to enjoy going for many years in the future. However, this proposed rule as currently constructed just spells disaster for this unique piece of America. I hope those of you who have the power to stop such a rule from becoming the law of the land, will take pause and listen to all sides of the equation and come up with a sensible solution that works for all parties involved in the enjoyment of one of America's Greatest Treasures... Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13671    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed.

Please create a plan to protect these special creatures from this form of entertainment. Special areas can be designated for off road vehicles. There should be no question as to prioritizing protection for our country's precious wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13672    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please reconsider allowing ORV's on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I vacation there every year. It seems that ORV's are allowed in many places on the Outer Banks. Why is it necessary to allow them on Cape Hatteras? It is a sensitive ecosystem that deserves to be protected as a national treasure.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13673    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific science-based protection for pedestrians and wildlife.

Adequate protection zones should be equal to those available for ORV use. Thank you for considering these comments and for the hard work and dedication of the National Park Service in preserving our natural and cultural heritage.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13674    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I understand closing some of the beaches to ORV do to wildlife, but in doing so you will be hurting not only other beaches but the economy of the regain as well. If you close some beaches that will increase traffic at the beaches that are not closed. This will damage these beaches quicker and worse then normal traffic. It will hurt the economy because many people go to these areas because they can drive on the beach. If they can't drive on the beach then they won't come. Therefor gas stations wont sell as much gas, food stores wont sell as much food and motels wont sell as many rooms. We don't need to hurt our economy anymore then it already is. You will lose a lot of out of state visitors and their money. A few of my friends live in Va and told me that they have a beach in Va, the only reason they come to NC is because they can drive on the beach. I understand about the animals, but what did they do before These beaches were created? On another note, NC should open up an ORV park with plenty of trails. This would satisfy many people and bring money to the state!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13675    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,06,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am the chairman of the planning commission for a small rural county on the Chesapeake Bay in Virginia. I have a working knowledge of balancing land use with property rights. I grew up on a family farm where I live now & participated in Girl Scouts & 4-H throughout my youth. I had the opportunity to hike part of the Appalachian Trail in Virginia as a teenager. As an adult, I have been a practicing Registered Nurse for 32 years. Needless to say, the great outdoors and all living things are important to me. But I cannot support FR Doc # 2011-16878 for many reasons. It is excessive control and completely fails to balance the needs of all concerned. I have vacationed at the Outer Banks for 30 plus years. I prefer Hatteras Island over all other areas on the OBX. The beaches on the National Seashore Park are so much cleaner than the beaches north of the Bonner Bridge. The trash I have seen on the southern beaches have been where the people have clustered in front of ocean front houses, where no ORV are allowed in the summer months. It is so much easier for me to access the beach with an ORV than using a long ramp & stairs or walking over the dunes due to a broken back in 1999. It has already been documented the job losses due to the last round of regulations. Hatteras Island's economy, especially after Hurricane Irene, can not withstand more insult. I would caution the Department of the Interior to not give the Tea Party and like minded citizens a leg to stand on with over zealous regulations. Land use has invigorated the local Tea Party in my county. This issue would play right into their hands on the national level! It is ironic that tax paying citizens who have bought the land & pay the salaries of the National Park Service have less rights than turtle eggs that can be moved & bird eggs that are at the fringe of their migratory area. I ask that reasonable common sense be applied to your decision.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13676    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13677    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please consider wildlife protection a priority as you finalize the regulation governing the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. This natural habitat is vitally important as an ecosystem for birds, turtles, and other creatures. Ensuring their protection is yet another step in ensuring the vitality of America's shoreline and enjoyment for current and future generations. I ask that you consider

protecting more land and explicitly protecting the wildlife that shares our shores with us. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13678    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. It seems like that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. Please add regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13679    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13680    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** To the National Park System:

It is with a sadness that I write to you about regulations for Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I understand that proposed regulations do not specifically set aside areas for the protection of shore birds and turtles from ORV use. There are many natural causes for threats to these birds and turtles and with ORV's threat, their population will surely diminish.

Please make regulations that give balance to the protection for sea birds and use for recreational use.

Thank you for this opportunity for comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13681    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches. The proposal the National Park Service is poised to adopt regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving. The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving. The proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas. In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline and all it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over. Please make the law stronger to protect our natural wildlife from harm. Thank you, Nanette Oggiono

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13682    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The idea of this bill passing is frightening - all for the lousy joy of riding a 4 wheeler or other such vehicle. One can only hope that these off-roaders are unaware of the consequences borne nature, all in the name of a thrill.

**Correspondence ID:** 13683    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** am grateful for the opportunity to comment on the plan for the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I personally do not believe that natural areas should be used for motorized recreation. Bird and turtle nesting habitats should be protected. And in today's over mechanized world, people need places to get away from motors. ORVs have driven me away from many places that would be wonderful without them. They are a loud and obnoxious lobby group but please do not cave in to their demands. People and wildlife need extensive buffers from noisy destructive vehicles.

Thank you.

Sally Vogel

**Correspondence ID:** 13684    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state.

It is important to me and many others who enjoy the natural beauty of our shorelines without the noise and nuisance of the ORVs and the destruction of the natural habitat for the endangered animals and sea birds. Let them have their fun in man made recreation areas made especially for that type of recreation.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

**Correspondence ID:** 13685    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13686    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a

natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13687    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13688    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13689    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and

pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

I personally have visited Cape Hatteras for vacation about 5 times, each stay lasting a week or two. I am an environmentally conscious watersports enthusiast, who found it hard to believe how unregulated beach ORV driving was in a place with such an important role in wildlife preservation. We are living in a time when it is imperative to protect our natural resources, and I believe that it would be rather selfish and inconsiderate to not address these issues.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13690	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am extremely concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.						

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13691	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please limit ORV use near wildlife areas! As an ORV owner and driver, I find enjoyment in many places with my vehicle, not only on a wildlife-filled beach habitat. In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.						

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over. Please do the right thing and encourage other ORV users to be considerate to vulnerable wildlife.

Thank you! Dr. Maria Aitken

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13692	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please look into regulations regarding the use of motorized vehicles on the beaches. Wildlife is being destroyed needlessly. The is but one planet and we have to share it.						

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13693	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Threatened species like piping plovers rely on lands along Cape Hatteras National Seashore to survive. But if off road vehicles are permitted to use huge portions of the Seashore, their nests and chicks could be disturbed.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13694	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	please protect birds and all wildlife on the beach by restricting vehicle travel.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13695	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
---------------------------	-------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------	-----------------	---

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13696    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13697    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please help the wildlife survive.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13698    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13699    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to express my concern about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is absolutely unacceptable. Please



revise this plan to include the current buffers and other protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen significant gains in the area. Sea turtles and piping plovers are rebounding. It is almost certain that if you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife will be negatively impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan appears to protect beach drivers more than it does wildlife. This falls far short of the Park Services obligations under the Organic Act. The proposed plan sets aside only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. At least half the Seashore (preferably more) needs to be designated as vehicle-free.

Thank you for your considering my comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13700	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	The idea that motorized vehicles would be able to run rough-shod over a National Seashore site is ludicrous. The wildlife depend on the ecosystem for their very existence - those riding the various machines do not. I am sick and tired of the National Park System bending over backward to accommodate the most destructive of those who would use this area when the majority of visitors are much more interested in seeing nature and enjoy peace and quiet. Yellowstone is no longer enjoyable during a winter visit due to the loud, smelly and obnoxious snowmobiles - ENOUGH IS ENOUGH!!!!!!						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13701	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	"I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.						

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the <http://www.regulations.gov/Regs/clear.cache.gifPark Ser>

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13702	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Sincerely,

Aliza Sutker

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13703    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

Thank you for considering these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13704    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It's absolutely wrong to open these precious resources to drunken idiots who always destroy everything in their path. I can't think of 1 good reason to destroy the land which homes so many animals, birds, & plants.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13705    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Our World's oceans, seashores, and ALL of their inhabitants, are VITAL / CRUCIAL to the very survival of our planet ~ not to mention the quality of life on this beautiful planet ~ should we humans actually take the actions so critically needed to preserve (and, in some cases, to Restore), the VERY LIFE on our HOME planet. Excruciatingly VITAL to this preservation of Life is: OUR OCEANS, OUR SHORELANDS, OUR NATIONAL PARKS, AND AAAAAAALL THE LIVING CREATURES DEPENDENT UPON THESE HABITATS FOR THEIR ~ and, thus, our own ~ VERY SURVIVAL!!!! THANK YOU for actively recognizing these facts, and for taking whatever actions will ensure the protection of and future of these these VITAL living creatures and habitats, so Critical to the very survival of our planet, and even of humankind's continued Survival ~ as well as quality of Life! Most sincerely, Dr. Grace Drummond.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13706    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow recreational vehicles to interfere with the lives of our wildlife. These creatures are our riches, our inheritance, provided by our ancestors for us to enjoy and appreciate. And they are living creatures. Let someone else make money providing areas for recreationers. Let our wild creatures enjoy their lives in safety.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13707    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a

natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13708    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. This summer I have interned with the parks department to protect the Piping Plovers in New York, and the movement had many supporters, including local birdwatchers, scientists, and local residents concerned about wildlife conservation. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13709    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** we must keep our national seashores prestine! thankyou!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13710    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13711    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Murray,

I don't like the National Park Service's proposed new regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Protected wildlife has been making gains in the area. Sea turtles, piping plovers and many others are rebounding. With expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife will be impacted.

I support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore that continues all the needed protections of wildlife. More vehicle-free areas are

needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

Please revise this plan to include protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13712	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	please keep our national seashores prestine! thank you						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13713	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13714	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Dear Superintendent Murray,						

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13715	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13716    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I appreciate your time and consideration in this issue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13717    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13718    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

Please help save wildlife.

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration. Kristell Hemery

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13719    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I think there should be significant regulations regarding ORV in the National Park System, ESPECIALLY the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The turtle nesting sites need protection during this critical time and should be a valuable TOURIST attraction instead of an ORV roadway.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13720    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and speci

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13721    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13722    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13723    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** NOW

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13724    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate having this opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. Are the buffer areas large enough so that the nesting parents will still feel safe? How do we make sure that they are respected?

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. As a former docent for the Assateague National Seashore, I know what a great role the government plays in not only protection of, but also in the education to park users who once they understand the issues, also learn to value the species.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13725    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

v I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13726    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Tracy Stillwater

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13727    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such

as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13728    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13729    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am writing to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am appalled that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches! The proposal favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. We need specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. To give air, land, water, and noise polluting vehicles preferential treatment is unconscionable, and frankly, insane.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. Please take the actions that you are EMPOWERED to do and preserve the natural beauty of Cape Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13730    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Protect the shorebirds by outlawing offroad vehicles

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13731    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13732    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y



**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** save the wildlife of the cape and the cape will remain te national treasure it is and should be

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13733    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13734    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Reisman

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13735    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I'd like to comment on the proposed ORV regulation at Cape Hatteras National Seashore, a nationally significant site that protects habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife and one of the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of those who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

The current draft lacks critical wildlife protections that have aided species like the piping plover and loggerhead sea turtle. It's well documented that ORV use impairs park resources, like diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian

visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations.

Wildlife protections, on the other hand, work well. For the past several years NPS has enforced science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for shorebirds. And protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers, such as threatened and endangered sea turtles.

Yet NPS has omitted these and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. In doing so, and in specifying only areas set aside for ORV use, NPS fails in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To fix this, NPS needs to designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians.

Also, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas; it prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is allowed, at least 75% of the beach, or 50 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13736    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13737    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13738    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13739    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** As a long time visitor and lover of the Outer Banks, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

The Cape is a special place, beyond the Historical, the Natural Heritage is beyond value to our country, it is a place for everyone, not just for a few who would destroy it in their endeavor to enjoy it.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Dennis Ahearn

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13740    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** As usual, US regulators, in this case NPS, are proposing rules that are vastly inadequate to protect wildlife: this time at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I object to the un-democratic restriction on length of this comment.

ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore has long been decimating wildlife, especially beach-nesting birds and at risk sea turtle nests. ORVs are noisy, disruptive and destructive to the taxpaying public who contributes to the park's maintenance. A drastic 85% decline in nesting shorebirds is being linked to ORVs in the park! ORVs must be restricted to non-critical areas far from people and nesting seabirds and turtles. Only a handful, a small fraction of the visitors of the park, use ORVs, thus there should only be a small fraction of the park's area, if any, allowed for ORVs. Wildlife and the human/park experience must be protected! Why should a few ORVs be allowed to ruin the experience of so many who are disgusted at the noise and pollution from these annoying vehicles? For caretakers of the environment, wildlife protections are not optional! Families should be allowed a simple quiet, peaceful enjoyment of the public areas, but noisy, polluting ORVs destroy that experience, while forcing out the very wildlife that many come to visit. Lest the wildlife is scattered from the park and destroyed, and people's peaceful enjoyment is shattered, a ban on, or tough ORV regulations at Cape Hatteras must be implemented. Out of 67 miles of park, only 1 mile should be open to ORVs, if any. Any more would be unfairly disproportionately in their favor. Why does NPS want to allow ORVs to "run wild" through the environmentally critical park? Is NPS run by teenagers with noise and speed on their minds? Does NPS realize how people hate ORVs for ruining their experience and for their reckless nature? There are plenty of areas outside the park where noisy, disruptive ORVs can have fun without harming wildlife. NPS: FOR ONCE DO THE RIGHT THING-KEEP ORVs OUT.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13741    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this

plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13742    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13743    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13744    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13745    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michelle L. Azar

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13746	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please protect the wildlife from vehicles near shorelines. thanks						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13747	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Although I live in NJ now, I have visited Cape Hatteras many times. The area and it's flora and fauna MUST be protected from human development so my children and future generations can appreciate it's natural beauty. It is also essential for the survival of humanity that we preserve the diversity of our environment and ecological systems.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13748	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I object to the restrictions on length of comment here for this proposed rule. I object that no EIS will be prepared for the use of ORVs in Cape Hatteras. Only by ignoring the human experience at the park could the NPS determine that no significant impact will occur while allowing ORVs in the park. Thus the notion that no EIS is needed is evading responsibility to protect the park and public, as well as the environment they come to visit.						

It appears NPS is serving the ORV industry, not the visitors to the park who look for quiet, peaceful enjoyment of these public areas. There are plenty of areas accessible to ORVs outside the park; ORVs should not be allowed to harass wildlife and the visitors who come to see the wildlife at Cape Hatteras National Seashore! An 85% decline in populations of several species of seabirds, and their reproductive failure at the park can be linked to the presence of ORVs. How can beach-nesting birds sit calmly on nests when noisy, polluting ORVs whiz toward or past them? ORVs on beaches represent a DIRECT ASSAULT on beach-nesting birds and sea turtle nests, and should not be tolerated. The irresponsibility of NPS to even propose, let alone enact, meaningful regulation is indicative of an agency that is run by a staff of teenagers or ORV industry-friendly antagonists of nature. Remarkably, the NPS insists there are no significant adverse impacts on public health, safety, threatened or endangered species, & would allow ORVs to run rampant over 41 of the park's 67 miles. Nothing could not be farther from the truth. Quiet enjoyment of the park's resources, incl. birdwatching & simple use of the beach shattered; visitors go elsewhere: that is impact. Wildlife are harassed into scattering from their nests-running fearfully from the noisy threats of these inappropriate vehicles. Thrill-riding is what these vehicles are made for - to buzz around the beaches where they can destroy the peace of the place. NPS: DO YOUR JOB! No ORV's in the park!

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13749	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include						

specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13750    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13751    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Besides, there are a multitude of places that ORV riders already can enjoy the outdoors. They don't need to be able to ride them everywhere.

Thank you again for listening.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13752    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13753    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I understand in these hard economic times that cuts need to be made. I hope that you will keep our beaches free of vehicles. When OTV's are allowed to run on protected area's the nesting sites for both birds and turtles is greatly disturbed. Thank you, Elizabeth De Long

**Correspondence ID:** 13754    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13755    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am a professional conservation biologist. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

A

**Correspondence ID:** 13756    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. There needs to be specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. Under the current interim plan the number of nests built by protected wildlife on Cape Hatteras has increased. Protection is working, these species are important, so continue to protect them. The Park Service needs to set aside more areas for pedestrian and wildlife use. The current proposal protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife and pedestrians. Please enact regulations that protect wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles, whose use of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is crucial for nesting, from off road vehicles.

**Correspondence ID:** 13757    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

Thank you for considering these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13758	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	We have so little wildlife left we need to do whatever it takes to preserve the precious creatures that we have left.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13759	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I no longer live near the ocean, but I have fond memories of the time I spent there. Today I live in the hills of western N.C. and my dogs and I spend most of our time in the New River. There is so much happening around water! Promoting these areas, and protecting them, are truly money well spent.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13760	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I am totally opposed to unrestricted off road vehicle use. It threatens sea turtles, shore birds, & other wild life. I don't go to the beach to hear motors either. I go to enjoy the wildlife & take in the sounds of nature.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13761	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	this has got to stop!						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13762	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	As I understand things, there are proposed regulations which will control what happens at Cape Hatteras for decades and set a precedent for other national parks. Hopefully the plan will be BALANCED in that it would guarantee adequate space and protections for WILDLIFE, while still allowing responsible beach driving in SOME areas so that all visitors can fully enjoy this national treasure. As I understand it to be written, the proposed regulation does NOT mandate specific, science-based protections for the wildlife that depends on the Seashore. Rather (distressingly), it protects ONLY the rights of off-road vehicle users to drive on large areas of the beach to the exclusion of wildlife. It apparently considers wildlife protection to be optional. Further, it provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches. I want the National Park Service to know that I and people like myself support management at our national parks that SAFEGUARDS wildlife FROM off-road driving and						



BALANCES the needs of ALL user groups.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13763    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing off road vehicle use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I have been a frequent visitor there since the 1970s, and feel very strongly about protecting this national treasure.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13764    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** PLEASE ... leave these magnificent trees alone so future generations and for those of us who have yet had a chance, to see their surreal beauty.

So much is destroyed in the name of progress. So many homes and materials already exist. In fact, we have a glut of things. We are a nation of excess and very quick to ruin the only natural resources we have.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13765    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13766    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13767    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I worked as a biological technician, surveying protected birds and sea turtles, at the CAHA National Seashore several years ago, and so I got to experience first-hand what kind of chaos beach-driving creates for the wildlife AND for the land managers tasked with protecting wildlife. I recommend complete closure to beach-driving during the bird & turtle nesting season. Beach-driving can resume in the late fall to spring, but during the nesting season, it is just too risky for the wildlife and too difficult to manage. I oppose the plan as it currently stands. Sincerely, Naomi Avissar Wildlife Biologist

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13768    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am a midwesterner that makes an annual migration to your shores for a dose of ocean. I've had opportunity to see the rebounds made by your bird communities under the interim plan and am very concerned about the Park Service's proposal for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras.

Expanded ORV use will certainly have an impact on threatened and endangered wildlife. The recent appearance of a green loggerhead in Delaware shows that we don't yet know the changes we'll see in wildlife movements due to the changing climate, and caution is called for in declaring 'enough' protection for them in this fragile environment. 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore is Not enough. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife (and midwestern pedestrians).

Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore!

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13769    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow off road vehicles on the fragile coast line. Wildlife is threatened, and there is no reason to allow the vehicles.

Make Americans walk. They need the exercise. :)

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13770    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13771    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Areas protected for the purpose of wildlife have been shown to be beneficial for various species. As our population grows and we encroach upon more and more habitat that these animals use, it is important for us to remember to include them in our plans in order to keep them at viable population sizes. While I understand the importance of allowing people to use natural spaces, there should be strict regulations in favor of protecting the wildlife that has been long using the same areas. ORVs are especially a threat to plovers and turtles as these are tiny animals that people can't always see to avoid. In studying plovers on beaches with ORV use, it is not at all uncommon to come across squashed adults, chicks and nests in the track of ORVs. Nests in particular are camouflaged, have no hope of getting out of the way and are placed in areas where ORVs are likely to go if allowed. It's an

unfortunate thing when ORV and other outdoor users have the ability to vocalize their discontent with regulations when the plovers and turtles are not able to do the same. These animals need space and the safety of having an undisturbed area for at least during breeding, nesting and rearing season, which really isn't all that long. Please regulate!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13772    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Thanks for the chance to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13773    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13774    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I am concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection at Cape Hatteras National Seashore as optional, provides only a few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13775    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** As a regular and frequent visitor to many of our nation's National Park, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13776    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13777    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13778    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.

Speak out for wildlife. Visit [regulations.gov](http://regulations.gov) to oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife.

Finally, after years of advocacy and litigation by Defenders and our partners, the National Park Service is poised to adopt regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Yet the proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over.

We have made great progress in winning important protections for Hatteras' wildlife, and we can't lose traction now. ORV

advocates want the entire seashore open to beach driving. Tell the Park Service instead that you support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13779    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13780    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13781    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I have vacationed there in the past and consider it to be one of our national treasures. I also believe that one person's freedom ends where another's begins. Everyone's right to a pristine natural environment should be sacrosanct and not subject to the damage caused by a few who want to use off road vehicles. ORVs simply don't belong in a nature preserve, period.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this

plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13782    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles are SO destructive to the environemnt. Please greatly limit their use especially on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13783    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** With so many species endangered it makes sense to take every precaution to safeguard them in every way possible. Off road vehicles are not conducive to preserving threatened wildlife.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13784    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I respectfully request that you add specific protections for wildlife and pedestrian visitors into the ORV regulation to ensure wildlife recovery continues and that the safety of all visitors is protected.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13785    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I live near some areas that were once beautiful and unspoiled. 4 wheelers do alot of damage with their big tires especially when it is wet. Please do not allow them to tear up this beautiful area. Thanks, MIke.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13786    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I urge the NPS to protect the highly threatened beach nesting birds, turtles and other wildlife of Hatteras National Seashore by banning wheeled vehicles on wildlife critical areas of the beach.

My concern arises from the fact that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. We can do better. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The struggle to protected the wildlife of our over-used beaches is a national concern and here in Florida we are pushing for similar protections against the historical, but outmoded tradition of vehicular access to beaches. A joint use policy in such a high profile area will help us all.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13787    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I visited Cape Hattaras and surrounding area-it is a beautiful place and very unique - it needs TLC especialy after Irene. What we do now continues to affect our future...

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13788    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

Thanks you for protecting our national parks. It is important to have some places that are in their natural state.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13789    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It is a national treasure, which I have enjoyed visiting. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13790    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We do not need off road vehicles killing birds in thier nests. Find a way to send them elsewhere. They do not need to ride on beaches and polluting the area and making noise. NO to off road vehicles on beaches!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13791    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I oppose the proposed rule. I've read through many carbon copy comments in support of strict ORV regulations that are nearly identically and specifically reference the need for 'science-based' regulations. I agree that any action take should be science-based, however, none of what is proposed is based on science nor peer reviewed. The proposed rule is based on assumptions, guesses, and incomplete statistics.

In addition, the comment deadline must be postponed to allow sufficient time for residents of Hatteras Island dealing with the aftermath of Irene to have their voices heard.

Again, there are a multitude of comments in support of the proposed rule that are iidentical and have obviously been written by SELC, DOW, Audobon, or all three in conjunction for distribution to their supporters. This attempt to influence the system should be recognized and considered accordingly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13792    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please limit off-road vehicle (ORV) use to times and areas that will not endangerthe well-being of threatened species, such as plovers and sea turtles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13793    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am extremely concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses. I do not know too many people who visit the seashore and appreciate hearing the roar of ORV's during their visit.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I think it's a really critical time in protecting our wildlife and taking into account that once these treasures are gone, they are gone FOREVER.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13794    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Regarding the access to the beaches at Hatteras Island. It is an important economic resource to permit beach access to vehicles and people in this area. We are all struggling economically. The Audubon Society is so off base it is pathetic. Vehicles and certainly people were never an issue for the plover. And not to be mean hearted but people and the economy should be first. The Audubon Society now is trying to stop the rebuilding of highway 12 after the storm. Please stop placating these fools. Otherwise the only thing we will have left to eat after we are all poor is the plover.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13795    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I grew up in South Carolina and have had the opportunity to walk on undisturbed barrier islands. Unfortunately, in my lifetime the number of undisturbed beaches has decreased greatly. Please save some space for those of us who don't think a gasoline engine is the only good thing in the world!

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13796    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Hello, I am writing to oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Given that wildlife such as the plover and sea turtle need protected nesting areas, I feel strongly that there can and should be areas set aside that are free from off roading. There are plenty of other places to go for that. The desires of people to go off roading wherever they want does not take precedence over the life and death of other creatures who share our planet.

I ask that you revise the plan to include current buffers and even expand to further buffers. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13797    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I regularly go to national seashore areas near me in California. The reason I love them is that I can enjoy the beauty of nature and the peaceful sounds of the ocean. ORV users driving on the beach would simply destroy the pleasure my husband and I get from those seashores. I accept the right of ORV users to enjoy their sport at the seashore, but that needs to be balanced against



the rights of others who enjoy the peace and quiet -- and more importantly, the protection of the resident wildlife.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13798    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the chance to comment on your proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The Atlantic coast national seashores are the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach in the eastern US. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but are the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments.

ORV noise, pollution and dust prevents enjoyment of the park. The well-documented impairment of park resources by ORV use also includes diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. In contrast, when the Park Service enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds protected species rebounded, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in the last season prior to the plan's implementation.

Unconscionably, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short of its obligations under the Organic Act. To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

The regulation also fails to set aside adequate vehicle-free areas and prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then at least half of the beach must be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife.

Thank you for considering these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13799    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I support strong requirements to regulate and restrict Off Road Vehicles (ORV) in the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. ORVs are noisy, create pollution and disturb other visitors as well as wildlife. I believe ORVs should be restricted to a small area of the seashore and density must be kept low. The Seashore is for all of us to enjoy and the noise associated with these vehicles is unacceptable. Moreover, this area is critically important habitat for species such as piping plovers, red knots and loggerhead turtles. It is my understanding that an ORV crushed a nesting loggerhead last year, an accident must surely have been the result of irresponsible driving. Unless ORVs are restricted at Hatteras, the rest of us will suffer from the tyranny of the minority.

Thank you for considering my remarks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13800    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments, and for your time and consideration in this matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13801    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** This is your chance to help us and make a difference. Please help us. I know you will do the right thing. Thank you for your

time.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13802    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We love Cape Hatteras. The National Seashore is a national treasure. The proposed regulation should provide more beach areas for people to escape noisy and unsafe ORVs and enjoy the National Seashore in a natural state. More non-driving buffers should be provided around nest areas of birds and turtles. As is the practice in other national parks, vehicles and other potential threats should be restricted to specific "sacrifice areas" where they will do the least damage.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13803    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13804    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please restrict ORV use to certain areas of the National Seashore where they will do the least harm to birds, turtles and other wildlife and be the least nuisance for people. The regulation could be strengthened in that regard, based on scientific study and plain common sense.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13805    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13806    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I urge you to support regulations to manage the use of ORVs within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrian visitors by creating a natural, vehicle-free habitats. I believe that a plan can be implemented to allow recreational use of OFVs while still protecting sea turtles, nesting shorebirds and all other beach-living creatures. I believe this can be achieved by using non-driving buffers so the ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the CHNS.

In light of the recent devastation by Hurricane Irene, it becomes more imperative than ever that we protect our coastlines by ensuring that natural barriers remain in place to protect the estuaries, beaches, dunes and the man-made structures.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13807    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. This good work should be continued.

I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. ORVs are obnoxious to everyone (not just endangered wildlife) except the owners. They should be completely banned from beaches.

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses. Perhaps they can drive their ORVs over the tar sands!

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13808    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. We are very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. We support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13809    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13810    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not

continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13811    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13812    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I understand that we all love the environment. Some love it in ways that attempt to preserve its beauty for generations to come. There are those who love the thrill of bounding through forests and over coastal sands on vehicles that, although they may be fun, are loud and dangerous. Not only do the sounds of these off-road vehicles take away from the awesome sounds of Nature, they frighten wildlife and do their part to destroy the habitats of creatures who have already been pushed into smaller and smaller living spaces. Please consider regulations to protect what little wildlife we have left to enjoy. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13813    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** National Parks and Forests are meant for us to view as natural splendors, not to drive over or cause destruction! Animals have just as much, if not more right to live on this planet as we do. There are plenty of areas that do not contain endangered species to use ORV's.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13814    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13815    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** # I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such

as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13816    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** National Parks and Forests deserve more respect than we as humans have shown. We need to respect to the fact that animals need space to live, just as we do. ORV elsewhere. There is plenty of room for these activities where endemic species do not suffer.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13817    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback.

I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13818    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow off-road vehicle use on shorelines where sea turtles, birds and other wonderful creatures can be harmed and killed. Do have the courage to resist special interest groups with very short-sighted and selfish interests driving them.

Off-road vehicles are one of the worst inventions of our time. They destroy much wildlife, beautiful terrain and plants and for what? Mostly for momentary pleasure of unthinking people.

There are too many of us. The time for laws that cater to mostly-individual and selfish pleasures is past. We need to lead and educate all toward preservation of what is left of the beautiful natural world we've had the good fortune to enjoy.

You are making decisions with far-reaching effects. Thank you for making wise ones for future generations - to the 7th generation from ours and beyond.

Sincerely,

Natalie business and property owner - California, Montana, Idaho, Florida

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13819    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife.

Finally, after years of advocacy and litigation by Defenders of Wildlife and their partners, the National Park Service is poised to adopt regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Yet the proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number

rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over.

I do NOT want these areas open to beach driving and I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13820    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13821    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I have friends who vacation there each year - and go there for the beauty and to see nature... They are NOT interested in riding the beaches. Why can't government listed to the National Park Service and realized they are doing their best to preserve parks for not only the present but future generations to visit and enjoy. I believe in what they do, and am a proud member and visit a NP each time I vacation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13822    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** It is my opinion that humans need to stop having fun in areas of concern for endangered species. It is possible to ORV in areas that are not put under pressure as a result of our need to have fun. These areas are the permanent homes of endemic species, turned into temporary areas of fun. I enjoy four wheeling as much as the next person, just not in my living room.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13823    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

I believe ORVs are one of the worst inventions of our time. They are mostly used for selfish, momentary pleasures by unthinking people. We have allowed too much destruction in our time and it is time to stop.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this

plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

This means resisting the greedy pressures of special interests, with great courage on your part. Future generations will applaud you for such leadership. We have a great responsibility to protect the natural resources we've enjoyed - to the 7th generation and beyond.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13824    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I support a regulation that closes all of the Seashore to beach driving to protect wildlife and to protect this resource for future generations. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of Seashore beach. The entire area should be closed to beach driving.

If the Park Service does not close the entire Seashore to beach driving, then I urge you to include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and pedestrians in the regulation. I support non-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks and hatchlings, and specific protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and this is simply not acceptable. Please add buffers and other specific, mandatory wildlife protections to the regulation. I urge you to include science-based protections for all natural resources that strictly adhere to the "Highest Degree of Protection" as outlined in the USGS Protocols for Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13825    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** There are threatened species in this area. Please make sure that there are specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. Thanks

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13826    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13827    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened

and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13828    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore. It is heartbreaking that many plovers and sea turtles and sea turtle eggs are being run over by off-road vehicles. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Frances Twiss

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13829    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am against beach driving at Cape Hatteras beach. It destroys the priceless environment that is our real treasure in this country. Thank you for taking my voice into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13830    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13831    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y



**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** "I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act. To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation. Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas.

Thank you for considering these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13832    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13833    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13834    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** NOW IS THE TME

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13835    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13836    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13837    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** To whom it may concern: The Cape Hatteras area Supports a special function in perserving the special birds of the area. This is one of the unique functions of the natural environment that makes it special and draws people to it. The park system can find other, non-entrusive, enticing, human recreational activities that support the functions that naturally make this a special place. To threaten the nesting grounds is to set the stage for a short term draw to the area and when the area loses it birds and wild life and becomes torn up from the off road vehicles that finacial venture will close - and again, human wreckage will be left. I am sure the park service has the ability to think in a longer range than this and can find interesting financial endeavors as well.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13838    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Nesting areas for endangered and threatened species should have off road vehicles banned during nesting season, and the park should have limited access to off road vehicles during nesting season. Restricted areas should be clearly designated to avoid accidental destruction of nests.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13839    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I believe we should protect this area, Assateague Island has similar areas & has a small area open for those that want to drive on the beach & fish or enjoy more isolated beach areas, they charge a fee for this type of permit which helps support the wildlife & limits access by closing during nesting times. Please consider the protection of this beautiful natural resource. Thanks, Cyndy Williams

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13840    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** As a resident of Dare County, NC, and an owner of property in both Kitty Hawk and on Hatteras Island, I find the proposed restrictions over-bearing -- at the least. If there were valid numbers indicating that so many birds / nests have increased and/or an increase in loggerhead turtles (and other turtles), I might be convinced that this was the way to go. But so far, no one has

produced significant positive changes that have occurred to those species. I would like to see comparative numbers published -- before and after the restrictions were put into place. It has produced more ill-will than good-will.

I find it incongruous that the Audobon Society can dictate what they want on Hatteras Island, and then turn around and do just the opposite up in Pine Island - Currituck County; i.e., selling the Society property for development !! ??

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13841    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13842    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13843    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please save endangered species of birds that breed on NC Outer Banks. Stop off-road vehicles on our beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13844    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please restrict ORV and other traffic in sensitive environments where wildlife breed and live.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13845    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Save the breeding habitat for our piping plovers and terns. Stop the permitting of off-road vehicles on our beaches.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13846    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** This is a National Seashore and belongs to all Americans. One small group of users should not be allowed to destroy wildlife, especially wildlife that other go to the Seashore to see and enjoy. A sound management plan, based on science, and not recreational pleasures, must be drafted to accommodate all uses of the area.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13847    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** We live in Canada and over the last 20 years we went to Cape Hatteras 12 times. ( a 17 hours drive, so I guess we can say we love the Outer Banks ) We usually would go to the NPS Frisco Campground but we noticed as years goes by that there was less and less birds singing in the morning and there is no more crabs on the beach. Obviously, beach driving as modified the environment for the wildlife and I feel it's not a healthy sign for years to come. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

Serge Lapointe and family, Canada

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13848    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I would like to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Because I care so very deeply about the health of this area, I am very concerned that the proposed regulation is not sufficient to protect the wildlife and birds that call this area home. I also believe strongly that providing areas for families like my own to be able to enjoy this outstanding natural area without concern as to whether an ORV will destroy the silence of nature, let alone cause destruction to the habitat of the wildlife, is my inherent right. The proposed plan will in no way be consistent with either of these goals. It favors the rights of the ORV users over rights of citizens and all wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for people who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

A National Seashore belongs to all the people of our nation. Please help keep this area free of destructive ORV use.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13849    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not permit vehicles on the beach at Cape Hatteras. It is totally in contradiction to what a wildlife preserve should promote as it is a direct danger and disruption to wildlife there. There are many ways to access the seashore that do not cause such destruction. Thank you for your careful consideration of this issue. Susan Flynt

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13850    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I know this is a form response below but it represents my views and feelings.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13851    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** If beach off-road vehicles are destroying wildlife, the simple solution is to stop. Humans are constantly invading wildlife areas.

It appears that in the past, turtles and others animals were making a comeback.

Let's give them a fighting chance.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13852    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Murray:

I am writing regarding the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I vacation in the area every summer, so I feel I have a personal stake in this issue.

I urge you to protect the recent gains made by wildlife in the area. Permitting expanded ORV use across the Seashore would severely threaten these gains.

The proposed plan for regulation of ORVs at the Seashore sets aside too few miles for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use.

I know that politically you must allow recreational ORVs, but the balance in the proposed rules is weighted too much in their favor at the cost of the general health of the Seashore.

A good plan needs to include the current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for considering my view.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13853    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off Road Vehicles can be a real problem when they are allowed to be self-regulated. Their popularity continues to grow and our public lands continue to suffer. I have seen the damage first hand and have experienced the deleterious effects of the air and noise pollution.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13854    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I oppose unrestricted driving on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. I implore you, should you choose to allow beach driving please protect the wildlife on the beaches. Last summer I was an intern in Volusia County. I was able to work with the sea turtle nesting program and shorebird nesting. The driving regulations enforced there were a great benefit to wildlife. Some regulations of paramount importance to include, should you choose to allow beach driving are as follows: Prohibit driving at night during sea turtle nesting season. This is typically the time where females come to nest and hatchlings emerge. Establish an organization of some sorts to do both sea turtle and shorebird nesting surveys each morning. Mark off these areas. I found most drivers don't want to disturb the wildlife and will stay away. Also, if an organization does not yet exist in Cape Hatteras don't forget that under the correct supervision volunteers are a great option for surveys! I know there's a budget crunch in our country right now, so don't rule out the option of volunteers working under an experienced person. When sea turtles begin to emerge from the nests establish a system for raking out the "ruts" from tire tracks. The hatchlings are only about 2 inches long. They easily get stuck in them where they are easy prey, or die from sun exposure.

I appreciate you reading my comments on this subject. I hope they were useful. Thank you for your time and PLEASE do the right thing to protect one of America's most amazing resources- our wildlife!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13855    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I understand you are going to restrict off road vehicles on some of the Cape Hatteras shoreline. I commend you for this move. However, I request that you expand your restriction to protect nest areas for sea birds and turtles, and human beach goers. While driving on the beach is fun, if it poses a danger to other being- human and otherwise- I think the recreational fun of driving on

the beach needs to be eliminated to protect the others. thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13856    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** There is no reason the entire seashore should be open to beach driving. I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. This is a simple plan and should be implemented, it does not harm anyone but unrestricted driving destroys wildlife nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13857    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13858    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13859    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for your attention and help with this very important issue.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13860    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I am a retired Wildlife Management Biologist, and know well the need for proper regulations to maintain rare species populations. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Please protect our wildlife, as a vital component of our great National Heritage!

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13861    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

There is not any way I could have stated my feelings any better than the above statements from the Audubon Society. I am an enthusiastic "birder," and feel strongly that we should do our level best to put the needs of birds and other wildlife and National Park spaces above the needs of wheeled vehicles.

**Correspondence ID:** 13862    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please keep these nuisances off beaches. They can play in parking lots.

**Correspondence ID:** 13863    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13864    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Marisa Morales Leander Tx, 78641

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13865    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect the animals. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13866    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

I hope to continue enjoying visiting and recreating at these and other National Park sites.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13867    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a



natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13868    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13869    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely, Jennifer Bambauer

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13870    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Leave wildlife alone in the very few remaining places they have left, thanks to the overabundance of the human race. We are not so special that we can murder & destroy at will.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13871    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and

pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your attention to this important issue.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13872	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	IT IS VITALLY IMPORTANT THAT WE PROTECT OUR LAND & WILDLIFE FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13873	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please implement increased protections for wildlife and beach-nesting birds by expanding the length of beach that is off-limits to motorized vehicles and reserved for quiet enjoyment by pedestrians, nature-enthusiasts and swimmers. I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13874	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches. I strongly oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife. Please improve your proposed regulation and adopt regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Your regulations should protect more than the proposed 26 miles of seashore and should have specific clauses to protect the wildlife and its nesting sites.						

Thank you for your attention in this matter.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13875	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a national treasure visited by millions of people each year taking in the natural beauty, the wildlife diversity and 67 miles of shoreline. But the impacts of unrestricted off-road vehicle (ORV) use has taken its toll on the threatened and endangered shorebirds and sea turtles that nest on the seashore's beaches.						

I am speaking out for wildlife. I oppose unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife.

The proposed regulation does little to protect wildlife nesting areas.

The proposal only sets aside areas for ORVs and does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. And it reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving.

In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13876	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the						

beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13877    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The well being of all creatures on this planet is critical to its survival. Allowing ATV vehicles on beaches and endangering wildlife who depend on those beaches is a great danger to all who call them home. Here is an instance where a few hours of "fun" should not take precedence over the environment.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13878    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and spel appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13879    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The human population continues to grow but this is not so for our the animals and wildlife in our fragile ecosystem in which we live. We are destroying beautiful birds and wildlife with off-road vehicles for a cheap meaningless momentary thrill of riding a car on the beach. These birds and wildlife have been existing peacefully on the beach for thousands of years...If humans think it's important to conquer nature then think again - our entire world can be destroyed with that mentality before realizing empowerment only comes from within.

When are we going to understand how wrong this is? We need to respect wildlife and our environment...to do otherwise is tragic, self-destructive and cave man like. Please do everything we can to protect the priceless wildlife on Cape Hatteras National Seashore and all other beaches. Don't forget the story of Dr. Seuss' "The Lorax" - let us profoundly understand what it means to respect animals and wildlife and take action accordingly.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13880    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a

natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13881    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

My husband and I have visited most of the larger national parks in this country and consider them all to be this country's greatest treasures. They must be protected from overuse and commercialization and preserved for future generations. They creatures that exist within them are an essential part of them and must also be protected.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13882    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13883    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Also, I am an avid wildlife lover and vacation in areas where the natural habitat of wildlife is sustainable and honored. There are many like me who want the Seashore to remain viable and protected for wildlife so our vacation experiences are authentic. The Seashore is on my list of places to visit in the near future.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13884    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicle threaten our wildlife. Please put an end to this. Thank you!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13885    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** We have a plenitude of roads in this country, paved and unpaved -- we do not have traffic signs or lights on our beaches and it is not safe for any forms of life to be terrorized by the off-road antics of a privileged few.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13886    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13887    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I sincerely request you to review your proposed regulation in the management of ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Erosion of seashore is a real threat to not only the people and businesses living close by but also to critical habitat to wildlife. ORVs do not belong here and many other areas in the inland provide suitable places for their recreation. Children & families also deserve to have a peaceful visit to the National seashores without the threat of ORVs running amidst them. Teenagers will always push their limits which means we have to wake up after a few fatalities.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13888    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** My gut reaction to the news of ORV's tearing up beaches is, "Tell the jerks to take their @#\$\$%^&\*ing nasty loud wasteful obscene vehicles to the landfill or some other place that, at least, they can't make any worse." That's not constructive, perhaps, but beyond protection of the turtles, plovers etc. is the broader one of waste: waste of fossil fuel, waste of clean air, waste of silence, waste of the future if these unhealthy practices continue. Let's intelligently, with good will, work out something equitable for all.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13889    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation needs to mandate specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. I look forward to visiting the Hatteras preserve in the future--but not on an ORV!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13890    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am attaching a paragraph that expresses how I feel But I wanted to add my own comments. Vehicles on a beach are a safety hazard for small children but also a terrible nuisance to families who are wanting a nice, quiet time at the beach.

I don't understand why ANY vehicles are allowed on the beaches in this country

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13891    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Please end the madness that often accompanies vehicles on the beaches of USA

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13892    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13893    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** No vehicles near nesting areas

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13894    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please completely restrict motorized vehicles from the nearshore environment. They add pollution and destroy habitat for multiple species:

Forage fish often spawn in the sediments between mean higher high water and mean lower low water and crushing them or displacing the sediments they attach to can reduce the amount of fish that feed upon them.

Turtle eggs are also particularly vulnerable.

Allowing non-motorized vehicles is a way to allow people to utilize the seashore in a recreational manner with much less impact as these are usually smaller and lighter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13895    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The unacceptable proposal does not mandate any specific measures to protect vulnerable animals from beach driving. It reserves only 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for wildlife and pedestrians year-round, setting aside the rest for year-round and seasonal beach driving. The proposed regulation will control what happens at Cape Hatteras National Seashore for decades and will set a precedent for other national parks.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13896    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow ATVs or other vehicles to disturb the nesting birds on Cape Hatteras Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13897    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please accept this letter as my comments on the National Park Service ORV Plan (RIN) 1024-AD85 for Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area, before you at this time. The Plan has little to do with developing a responsible off road vehicle management plan. The FEIS maps 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 way off base. A 1000 meter buffer zone for common shore bird nests is 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 easement 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 mammalian 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 eradicated disgusts me. Please consider all aspects of this Plan and put actual people, not lawyers, back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Sincerely, George W. Sobotka/Briner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13898    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13899    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Hello:

As a private citizen of the USA, I oppose unrestricted offroad vehicle use on our beaches. These vehicles threaten and indeed injure and kill wildlife like turtles, birds and other creatures.

Thank you,

Alex M Danik New York, NY USA

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13900    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please keep most of our beaches free of ORV traffic. These machines not only disturb wildlife--they disturb the whole experience for people like me. I want quiet beaches!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13901    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Superintendent Murray,

I am writing to you today about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Specifically, I am concerned that protected wildlife that has seen huge gains in the area may suffer if expanded ORV use is allowed across the Seashore.

The Park Service plan should adequately protect wildlife while allowing limited access for beach drivers to have fun. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.



Thank you for your consideration

Eric Abrams Bow, NH

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13902    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13903    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13904    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not permit off-road vehicles to destroy wildlife!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13905    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Come on National Park System, DO YOUR JOB. Why should vehicles be allowed in crucial nesting areas???

Robin Hirsch

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13906    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13907    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please add these comments to the official record regarding the Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

The 7 national seashores on the Atlantic represent the last open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the US. These places protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include increased safety hazards for pedestrians, and increased wildlife mortality. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, and protections for migrating, wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have rebounded. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007, the last season prior to the implementation of the plan.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act "to conserve the scenery (of the seashore) and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations." To remedy this flaw, the Park Service MUST designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This is an UNFAIR imbalance for other users and for wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashor

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13908    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13909    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am disturbed by the wreckless ,disruptive and environmentally damaging use of vehicles on beaches. I believe that we have a responsibility as citizens to maintain the natural environment and develop more environmentally friendly entertainments. As well there is the consideration of the need to decrease use of petrochemicals

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13910    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13911    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13912    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13913    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Common sense dictates that we protect these animals that never evolved with off-road vehicles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13914    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13915    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please accept this letter as my comments on the National Park Service ORV Plan (RIN) 1024-AD85 for Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area, before you at this time. The Plan has little to do with developing a responsible off road vehicle management plan. The FEIS maps out a plan to exclude humans from the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area. The plan states that there will be a fee for a permit to drive on the small amount of beach that is open to ORVs after all of the bird and turtle closures are in place, but there is no mention of what the fee will be. The plan then goes on to state that there will be no limit to the number of permits that will be issued but there will be a limited number of vehicles allowed to enter the beach. It sounds to me like the National Park Service will be selling permits that they cannot guarantee will be valid. There will not be permits to drive on the beach, but permits to have a chance at maybe driving on the beach! This is ludicrous. The plan goes on to state that in order to obtain a permit to have a chance to maybe drive on the beach, the potential permittee will be required to complete a training course. There is no mention, however, how the Park Service would administer the training course to several thousand individuals every Saturday and Sunday of the season. The author of the Plan must have never sat in the traffic jam that forms from Grandy to Southern Shores while waiting to drive onto the outer banks on a Saturday or Sunday afternoon. Please consider all aspects of this Plan and put actual people, not lawyers, back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Sincerely, George W. Sobotka/Briner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13916    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The Outer Banks of North Carolina, including Cape Hatteras National Seashore, constitute a very long distance of shoreline. It is not necessary for humans to invade every inch of this Park. Just because there are vehicles capable of navigating this terrain, doesn't mean that they should. Areas should be set aside for nesting seabirds and nesting sea turtles that are off limits to the public, especially those people with ATVs and dogs. This seems to be a problem unique to North Carolina. There are NO public beaches in Georgia or South Carolina where people are allowed to drive on the beach. In Florida, there is only Daytona Beach, and this is now under review because of issues with danger to humans and to wildlife. Please enact regulations that will keep ORV's out of sensitive wildlife areas.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13917    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** These special regulations are a bad move, not only for birds and turtles, but also for people. You know, not everyone wants to see off road vehicles everywhere. I want places that are only for foot traffic. I've seen too many instances of off road vehicles tearing up the land, creating even more pollution, and stressing out the people who live nearby with all the noise that the vehicles create.

Please let someplaces remain for foot travel only.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13918    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off-road vehicles away from sensitive nesting sites at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13919    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13920    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

Thank you for your consideration.

Liz Hickman-Heyner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13921    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow ORVs into the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13922    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened

and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13923	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore. During our family visits we prefer wilderness and pedestrian-only areas. Wildlife is top priority.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13924	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	"The greatness of a nation and it's moral progress can be judged by the way it's animals are treated."-Gandhi						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13925	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Keep off-road vehicles out of natural, wild places. Keep them ON THE ROADS where vehicles belong.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13926	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Thank you for offering the public this opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing off-road vehicle (ORV) use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have begun to make an impressive comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation abandons this progress, treating wildlife protection as optional and providing few areas for visitors to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches.						

Whether viewing wildlife or simply relaxing at the shore, we need places to escape the noise and tension of daily life. The proposed regulation, however, favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific and enforceable science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will protect the species whose lives depend on the Seashore only if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nesting areas. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13927	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
---------------------------	-------	-----------------	-------	------------------	-------	-----------------	---

**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** September 2, 2011

Dear National Park Service:

The Maryland Ornithological Society thanks the National Park Service for opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Off-road vehicle (ORV) use has been well documented as a threat to park resources. It reduces access to other users and presents an increased safety hazard to pedestrians and wildlife. Consequently, the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. These species have rebounded, with sea turtle nests increasing by close to one hundred percent. Beach nesting bird species listed under the Endangered Species Act, e.g. Least Tern and Piping Plover, as well as the spectacular Black Skimmer, have also benefited.

However, the proposed regulations omit these buffers and other successful wildlife protections. The Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation. Per the Park Service's Organic Act, wildlife protection should not be optional, it is required.

We believe the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. The proposed regulation prohibits ORVs year-round on only 26 of the 67 total miles of seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife. If ORV use is to be allowed within the seashore, then a minimum of half of the beach, or 33.5 miles, should be available year round for non-ORV users and wildlife. Please also reinstitute mandatory no-drive buffers around bird and turtle nests.

As we did in similar comments filed with the Service in May 2010, We urge the National Park Service to apply lessons learned at Assateague Island National Seashore, here in Maryland, in regulating ORVs at Cape Hatteras. NPS strictly regulates the use of ORVs at Assateague. Members of MOS are among those who use ORVs at Assateague under these regulations, holding beach driving permits as required. Less than half the island is open to ORVs, and there are limits on the number of vehicles allowed (145 in the Maryland part, 48 in Virginia or 18 when Toms Cove Hook area is closed due to bird nesting). ORV drivers must display an annual permit issued by NPS. (The details of the Assateague program can be found at: <http://www.nps.gov/asis/planyourvisit/upload/OSV.pdf>)

We do not categorically object to ORV use because many members of MOS own them. We use these vehicles to visit birding areas, which often are accessible over sand or rough roads. We rely on land-managing agencies to advise us, through regulations and closures, which routes are not suitable for ORVs because of potential damage to wildlife and to wildlife habitat.

MOS is a statewide nonprofit organization established in 1945 and devoted to the study and conservation of birds. Currently we have 15 chapters and approximately 1,500 members. Some are scientists and naturalists, but our membership includes people of all ages and all walks of life, from physicists to firefighters, legislators to landscapers. Birding is one of the fastest growing types of outdoor recreation. MOS members frequently visit Cape Hatteras National Seashore to view the unique birdlife which occurs there.

Thank you for consideration of these views.

Sincerely,

Kurt R. Schwarz Conservation Chair Maryland Ornithological Society

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13928	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Please accept this letter as my comments on the National Park Service ORV Plan (RIN) 1024-AD85 for Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area, before you at this time. The Plan has little to do with developing a responsible off road vehicle management plan. The FEIS maps out a plan to exclude humans from the Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreation Area. " The NPS believes that the information used in preparing the plan/FEIS and the subsequent decision to issue this proposed rule is of sufficient quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity"						

The NPS was out on the beaches of the outer banks the day after hurricane Irene passed through sending up a 5 to 10 foot storm surge. They were using hand held GPS units to locate the spots where turtle nests had been so that they could reset the closures for the inundated/washed out nests. I do not think that we can trust the judgment of the NPS on environmental issues.

Please consider all aspects of this Plan and put actual people, not lawyers, back into the management of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Sincerely, George W. Sobotka/Briner

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13929    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** PROTECTING THE ENVIRONMENT AND ENDANGERED SPECIES IS PARAMOUNT.

ONCE WE LOSE THESE PRECIOUS SPECIES AND HABITATS, THERE IS NO GOING BACK.

EXTINCTION IS FOREVER. PROTECT THEM NOW.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13930    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13931    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Sir/Madam,

Regarding regulations for beach driving on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Pls provide strong regulations to stop unrestricted off road vehicle use that threatens sea turtles, shorebirds and other wildlife in the park, especially to protect wildlife nesting areas for turtles, nesting & feeding shorebirds etc

thank you

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13932    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

ORVs are also noisy and disrupt quiet space for humans. I go to National Parks to be close to nature. I don't think noisy polluting vehicles, including snowmobiles, have a place in our national forests, parks or wildlife areas unless rangers or rescue



personnel are using them.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13933    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I have been a resident of Dare COUNTY for many years & helped with Defenders of Wildlife during the case to save the Endangered Loggerheads & Piping Plover Birds from the damage of ORV use, during their nesting seasons. It was proven then that it was a success due to the egg counts had tripled & no tourism or businesses or economy was affected in any way. The NPS was simply reminded & educated by DOW to do their jobs. Also do not forget that the Red Wolf Sanctuary was & is a success due to Defenders & that Now many tourists enjoy the Howl Ins. DOW has notified our state & Gov. that if a hurricane were to come that there would be geographical changes & that a new bridge needed to be built FOR the residents (FIRST) & then also to be built not in same place but in another location so as to not have same result & to protect Pea Island. WHY Dare county wants to always cause an incooperation with DOW is juvenile & unacceptable, when their scientists have been & are right. & always create a success story for the future. Now the beaches are being destroyed alone by ORVs, now we have them destroying STILL our wildlife. Enough is Enough. There is plenty of room on the whole OBX for areas of ORV to destroy if you MUST, but DO NOT destroy EVERY beach & ALL wildlife, for our future children would like to enjoy what was here first! What lawyers & the OBX hospital & many stores have in their buildings-pictures of sea turtles & piping plover birds? If you like the Pictures, why not Love the real thing & try to save them? & stop killing them? what if it were the mustangs? these animals ARE ENDANGERED & there should be no fuss about it. SAVE them or you are breaking the law. & stop changing laws like MT & ID have done to Kill the majestic wolf, that in their states, ppl go to see them in Yellowstone, but then their gov't wants to kill the animals? makes no sense..same scenario here. Make a Change for the betterment of the Wildlife & not the recreation.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13934    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please stop people from off roading on the beaches. Its killing the piping plovers and sea turtles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13935    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13936    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this

plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13937    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please keep off road vehicles off of Cape Hatteras !!!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13938    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13939    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Our national seashores should be protected from ORV's which are dangerous to the public as well as wildlife and birds in the area. There are not many natural areas left for us and the future generations to see.

Please control the area for ORV use.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13940    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** About the NPS proposed regs for managing ORV use in Cape Hattaras Nat Seashore....NO NO NO NO ORV use! Protection of the beach-nesting birds MUST be PRIORITY 1!!!! Please protect our wildlife...NOT the "fun" of humans on destructive ORVs!

Please. Please help protect our oceans & our beaches & our birds & their nesting areas...now & forever.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13941    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I am writing about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13942    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13943    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

As an environmental policy professional, I am truly concerned about the proposed plan to manage off-road vehicles on Cape Hatteras.

While I recognize your need to balance all stakeholders' interests, expansion of vehicle use on the shore would very likely erase the recent gains in nesting success and wildlife survival.

Regulation of these vehicles is vital to the Cape Hatteras wildlife; beach drivers' ability to cruise the shoreline is not vital to their enjoyment of the area.

Certainly, drivers should be free to utilize beach areas that are not inhabited by birds, turtles, and such. However, buffers must be enforced to protect the species that depend on Hatteras.

Wildlife protection should be a priority in a National Seashore. Many less valuable areas are available for off-road vehicle use.

Thank you for considering my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13944    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** What would be the point of destroying the environment? How do you expect it to support human life?

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13945    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should

also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for your time and attention to my comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13946    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect the Outer Banks by curbing OTV usage and protecting the land and animals.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13947    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Park Service's proposed regulation. The seven national seashores on the Atlantic Ocean represent the last vestiges of open, wild, undeveloped beach on the eastern seacoast of the United States. These nationally significant places not only protect habitats for rare, threatened, and endangered wildlife, but represent the last best places where Americans can visit wild beach environments that evoke the experiences of our predecessors who encountered the vast wild coasts of North America.

It is well-documented that ORV use impairs park resources. Examples include diminished access and increased safety hazards for pedestrian visitors, along with increased wildlife mortality and dwindling populations. On the other hand, wildlife protections work. For the past several years, the Park Service has enforced specific science-based measures like no-driving buffers around nesting birds and turtles, their nests, chicks, and hatchlings, and protections for migrating and wintering shorebirds. Under that temporary plan, protected species have been rebounding, with some reproducing in record numbers. For instance, under that temporary plan, threatened and endangered sea turtles laid 153 nests in 2010, compared to only 82 nests in 2007.

However, the Park Service has omitted these buffers and other successful wildlife protections in its proposed regulation. By doing so, and specifying only those areas set aside for ORV use, the Park Service falls short in its obligations under the Organic Act. To remedy this flaw, the Park Service must designate both ORV routes and specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians in the regulation.

Additionally, the regulation does not set aside adequate vehicle-free areas. As written, the regulation allows ORVs year-round on most seashore beach. This does not represent a fair balance for other users and wildlife.

Thank you for considering these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13948    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** The proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore is a long time in coming, but the basis heads in the totally wrong direction. ORVs do not need the imminent right of way over all objects, whether or not each one is alive. Besides posing a threat to two-legged humans, these vehicles are a blatant threat to all other living creatures.

Further, the wear and tear each and every ORV does to the natural terrain would shorten the existence of the natural domain. As much as motorized lobbying interests wish to expand their own manufacturing endeavors, this supposed gain in manufacturing would cause irreparable harm to the natural environment. The flimsy call for buffer zones would not suffice.

What we need is vehicle-free protection for all living things. ORVs are the antithesis of both progress and common logic.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this important matter.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13949    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback.

I am concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, and does not provide enough area for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches.

It seems to heavily favor the rights of ORV users to use extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife.

I strongly support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should set aside ample area for those uses which are more in line with wildlife protection, my top priority.

Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13950	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13951	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I have no problem with a well managed ORV program that is supportive of the ecosystem's needs.						

I have a problem with the prioritization of the revenue generated by ORV activity over the needs of the ecosystem.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13952	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I don't think this generation should be responsible for the loss of so much natural beauty.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13953	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13954    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13955    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Our wildlife in our iSeaside National Shorelines requires protection in perpetuity...turtles, birds, water fowl, and sea-life.

It is in your domain to insure these protections.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13956    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13957    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** As an avid watcher of Snowy Plovers here, I know how they react to noise and vehicles. Adversely. Ban the vehicles from the shore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13958    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13959    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13960    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray, I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13961    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13962    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I have no problem with a well managed ORV program that is supportive of the needs of the ecosystem.

I have a problem with the prioritization of the revenue generated by ORV activity over the needs of the ecosystem.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13963    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13964    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I am an annual visitor to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore. My family rents a home for two weeks in Frisco, NC. When I visited this past August, I learned of the ORV proposed rule, and was very upset about the consequences of this rule on my vacation visits to the area. I am attracted to the national seashore for its beauty, and for the privilege of using my ORV to fish and to visit, with my children and grand children, the many beach options that are accessible with my SUV. This past year, there were more beach closings than I ever remember, which impacted our ability to drive on the beach and enjoy a variety of landscapes and experiences. If further limitations are mandated, I would seriously consider not returning to the national seashore. For 15 years I've been visiting and enjoying this wonderful area, and exploring with my SUV. And for many years before I discovered the national seashore, thousands of others enjoyed this experience. I believe this will have a negative impact on the area, and many tourists who drive from many hours away, will consider other options. I can understand that some of the beaches might need to be closed from time to time to protect nesting Plovers or sea turtles, or migrating birds. But the proposed rule is punitive and I think goes much too far in restricting access. I also understand that action on this proposed rule has been languishing in bureaucratic red tape for about 38 years. Does it make sense now to change the rules, and risk losing millions of tourism dollars to Hatteras Island? I think not. I am also a big conservationist. I chair the Board of Pennsylvania's #1 environmental advocacy group. I understand the need for protection and management of our treasures, like the national seashore. I also understand that over management has a negative economic effect. If the proposed rule is allowed to move forward, this "enviromental victory" will have a negative economic effect. Please reconsider this. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13965    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** Let's work together in protecting and caring for our shared space here on Earth

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13966    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** As a family that enjoys National Parks, I implore you to keep the beautiful wildlife that so many of us come to enjoy at the parks safe! It is our duty to protect them, and make sure they have a safe place to live!

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13967    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y

**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00

**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov

**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13968    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y



**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Shorelines where wildlife nest and feed need to be protected. They are fragile and sensitive areas that cannot tolerate the destructiveness of off-road vehicles. There are plenty of areas where people can ride their vehicles that won't have the harmful impact that riding on beaches will. Please take this into consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13969    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13970    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13971    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13972    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be impacted.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13973    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please do not allow OTV's on the Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13974    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Let's grow up, and stop polluting the environment for those who have no way to defend themselves. We and they are offended by your lack of compassion, and demand you shut down access to these areas by motorized vehicles.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13975    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Tell the Park Service instead that you support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13976    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please protect wildlife nesting areas on beaches. Please take steps to support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting. We must take specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13977    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Park Service: 9/2/11

We write to encourage you to go forward with regulations to restrict driving by vehicles that threatens wildlife along the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

But we urge to you ban ORV and other non-essential motor vehicles from driving along the entire 67 miles of seashore.

You have here one of America's great natural treasures. It is a place where people come from all over to see wildlife in their natural habitat.

Mrs. Hiers and I have been here many times. We also enjoy state and federal parks elsewhere along the East and West coasts of

the USA. Again and again, we have noticed a big difference between places where vehicles are allowed and where they are banned on beach and dune areas.

Many times we have had to get out of the way of speeding vehicles and seen wildlife run over. As you know ORVs erode dunes and damage important vegetation. They also crush shellfish and other crustaceans which are vital to the food chain, especially for shore birds.

We feel strongly that people who want to run their ORVs and other motor vehicles have plenty of other places to do so where they won't be a meance to people who just want to enjoy being there, not just to churn through it in their vehicles for the fun of it.

So we urge you to ban vehicles from all wildlife and people sensitive areas.

Thanks you

Richard H. Hiers

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13978    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13979    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** .

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13980    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13981    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the

beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13982    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Off road vehicles are just a small portion of visitors to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore each year but they are the most vocal. We need to speak up for the piping plovers, sea turtles and shore birds along with all other wildlife that relies on this region. Please , please let us help these creatures that can't speak up for themselves

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13983    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13984    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** To Whom it may concern, The National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore falls short of protecting what is most special and fragile about the area and its natural inhabitants. There is nothing special, beautiful or life sustaining about having vehicles allowed on our seashore. There are places on the earth, and in particular, on this continent where autos should not be. Is there no escape from the everywhere-ness of autos with their noise, harm and ugliness? If you expand ORV use across the Seashore, threatened and endangered wildlife could be negatively impacted. Under the current interim plan, protected wildlife has seen huge gains in the area. Sea turtles that only created 82 nests in 2007, made 153 in 2010. Piping plovers and other shorebirds are rebounding. I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers over wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians. As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore. Sincerely, Deborah Taggart

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13985    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I strongly oppose unrestricted off-road recreational use. We do not need more damage to any part of our environment.

Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13986    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Please stop all vehicle use on these beaches.

The birds need this area and the vehicle drivers don't realize the damage they do to birds and other wildlife. There needs to be more awareness.

This is simply an unnecessary destruction of the natural world.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13987    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private

**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** BLESSED ARE THE MERCIFUL FOR THEY SHALL RECEIVE MERCY

**Correspondence ID:** 13988    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13989    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I support specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and additional vehicle-free areas for nesting.

This proposal does not mandate any specific measures to protect wildlife from beach drivers. It reserves just 26 of the Seashore's 67 miles of beach for pedestrians and wildlife year round, setting aside the rest for year round and seasonal beach driving. In recent years, a temporary plan that limits ORV use near protected wildlife nesting areas has been working to protect wildlife.

In 2007, protected sea turtles created just 82 nests on the shore. And in 2010, after 3 years of temporary protections, that number rose to 153. If wildlife is not explicitly protected under the Park Service's plan, these numbers could easily decline.

All it takes is one wrong step by a piping plover into an area that is not protected, and it could be run over.

Please protect wildlife.

**Correspondence ID:** 13990    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

**Correspondence ID:** 13991    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:**

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a

natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13992    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Dear Superintendent Murray,

I am very concerned about the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use on Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

I strongly support regulation of ORVs at the Seashore, but the Park Service plan protects beach drivers more than it does wildlife. The proposed plan sets aside currently only 26 of the 67 total miles of the Seashore for year-round wildlife and pedestrian use with open to year-round or seasonal beach driving. More vehicle-free areas are needed for wildlife and pedestrians.

As it is currently written, the proposed regulations treat wildlife protection as optional, which is unacceptable. Please revise this plan to include current buffers and other explicit protections for wildlife like piping plovers and sea turtles that rely on the Hatteras Seashore.

Thank you for your consideration.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13993    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** Wildlife and the environment should be protected at the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13994    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13995    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** If humans want to see the view, let them walk!

Please keep off-road vehicles OFF National Seashore property. Wildlife all over the world is vulnerable to our out-of-control species. Please protect nesting sea birds and sea turtles. Thank you.

---

**Correspondence ID:** 13996    **Project:** 10641    **Document:** 41993    **Private:** Y  
**Name:** private  
**Received:** Sep,02,2011 00:00:00  
**Correspondence Type:** regulations.gov  
**Correspondence:** I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape

Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13997	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	what will be left if we continue to allow vehiclces on sacred grounds....???						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13998	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	Americans are overweigh. They should be walking not wasting gasoline using stv,s which are so destructivew to the environment.						

---

<b>Correspondence ID:</b>	13999	<b>Project:</b>	10641	<b>Document:</b>	41993	<b>Private:</b>	Y
<b>Name:</b>	private						
<b>Received:</b>	Sep,02,2011 00:00:00						
<b>Correspondence Type:</b>	regulations.gov						
<b>Correspondence:</b>	I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the National Park Service's proposed regulation for managing ORV use of Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Under the current management plan at the Seashore, sea turtles and beach-nesting birds have made a tremendous comeback. I am very concerned that the proposed regulation treats wildlife protection as optional, provides few areas for families to safely enjoy vehicle-free beaches, and favors the rights of ORV users to drive on extensive areas of the beach to the exclusion of pedestrians and wildlife. I support regulations to manage ORVs within the Seashore that include specific, enforceable, science-based protections for wildlife and for pedestrians who wish to visit the National Seashore in a natural, vehicle-free state. The management plan should also set aside additional areas for those uses.						

The regulation will only protect the species that depend on the Seashore if it mandates specific, science-based protections, such as non-driving buffers around nests. Please add buffers and other wildlife protections to the regulation so that ORVs will not continue to dominate and degrade the Seashore.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments.

---