

From: [Mike Murray](#)
To: [Julie Youngman](#)
Cc: [Cyndy Holda](#)
Subject: Fw: Cape Hatteras ORV plan DEIS
Date: 11/24/2010 12:40 PM
Attachments: [CAHA DEIS Interim Comments Summary 11_07_2010.xls](#)

Julie,

Cyndy is out of the office through the holiday weekend, so I am responding to your information request on her behalf. Attached is a copy of the comment analysis report that was generated by the NPS Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) system for the draft ORV management plan/EIS (DEIS). As general description of the "Comment Analysis Methodology" is provided in Volume 2, page c-2 of the FEIS. I caution you that the numbers in the attached report cannot be interpreted as an accurate "vote" or preference poll on the DEIS alternatives for a variety of reasons, including the following:

- NEPA is not a voting process, and the public comment process under NEPA is not designed to be an opinion poll or a survey (i.e. the agency doesn't ask the public to state whether they support / oppose a particular alternative or management action).
- The purpose of comment analysis is 1) to pull out substantive comments so NPS can use them to add or correct information and analysis for the FEIS so the decision maker has the best information before making the decision; and 2) to respond to substantive comments as required by the CEQ regulations.
- The content of comments is up to the commenter. If "support / oppose" comments appear in a correspondence, then they are coded as such, but the number of comments coded a particularly way cannot necessarily be used to make an accurate statistical comparison (or anything other than a very rough relative comparison) of which alternative(s) commenters favored most, for a number of reasons. For example, some individuals may comment more than once, while some individuals may support or oppose an alternative but do not choose to state this explicitly in their comments.
- NPS received 15,285 correspondences in the manner specified in the Notice of Availability (i.e., written comments submitted to the park; electronic comments submitted in PEPC; and verbal or written comments submitted at the public hearings - using the transcripts of the public hearings, those comments were later entered into PEPC as individual correspondences). This cannot be interpreted as the exact total number of people commenting because some correspondences were signed by more than one member of the household, some commenters submitted more than one written or electronic correspondence, and some commenters submitted not only written correspondence but also presented verbal comments at one or more of the public meetings.
- Lastly, the 15,285 correspondences cannot be interpreted as all being "unique" comments because several thousand correspondences received were various form letters, signed by different individuals, generally advocating for either more restrictive or for less restrictive ORV management than that proposed by NPS alternative F in the DEIS. Form letters were given the same consideration as non-form letters.

Note: In addition to the 15,285 correspondences that were considered, NPS

received two sources of bulk comments gathered by a third party and delivered in bulk. Because these submissions did not comply with the "how to comment" procedures described in the various Federal Register Notices and press releases, NPS did not consider the bulk comments or include them in the analysis of comments. The Wilderness Society bulk delivered 16,453 comments to the park on May 11. Middle school teachers at Cape Hatteras Secondary School of Coastal Studies submitted 26 student comments in bulk. In both cases, NPS contacted the submitting party, advised them of the procedural concern, and provided them with information on how to submit the comments.



CAHA_DEIS_Interim_Comments_Summary_11_07_2010.xls

Mike Murray
Superintendent
Cape Hatteras NS/ Wright Brothers NMem/ Ft. Raleigh NHS
(w) 252-473-2111, ext. 148
(c) 252-216-5520
fax 252-473-2595

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This message is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure.

----- Forwarded by Mike Murray/CAHA/NPS on 11/23/2010 11:43 AM -----

Cyndy Holda/CAHA/NPS

To Julie Youngman <jyoungman@selcnc.org>
cc

11/22/2010 11:34 AM

Subject Re: Cape Hatteras ORV plan DEIS 

Julie,
Received your email request for information. Let me look into this for you and I'll get back to you by close of business today.

Cyndy M. Holda
Public Affairs Specialist
Cape Hatteras NS/Fort Raleigh NHS/Wright Brothers NM
252-473-2111 ext. 148
252-216-6455 cell
252-473-2595 fax
Email: cyndy_holda@nps.gov

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

This message is intended exclusively for the individual or entity to which it is addressed. This communication may contain information that is proprietary, privileged or confidential or otherwise legally exempt from disclosure.

▼ [Julie Youngman <jyoungman@selcnc.org>](mailto:jyoungman@selcnc.org)

Julie Youngman
<jyoungman@selcnc.org>

To "Cyndy_Holda@nps.gov"
<Cyndy_Holda@nps.gov>

11/22/2010 11:12 AM

cc

Subject Cape Hatteras ORV plan DEIS

Cyndy:

I'm writing with a request. I believe I read that you all received about 15,000 comments on the Draft EIS on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore ORV management plan, and had to reject several thousand more that were not submitted properly. But I have not seen a breakdown of those.

Could you please send me any information you might have showing the general breakdown of the comments? For instance, how many commenters were in favor of more miles of beach driving, how many were in favor of fewer miles of beach driving, how many were in favor of particular alternatives ... however it is that you might have categorized them.

Thank you so much. Happy Thanksgiving to everyone at Cape Hatteras.

Julie Youngman
Southern Environmental Law Center
200 W. Franklin St., Suite 330
Chapel Hill, NC 27516
(919) 967-1450
www.SouthernEnvironment.org