

# **Cape Hatteras National Seashore ORV Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement**

## **Alternatives Options Workbook: Compilation of Public Comments**

### ***Methodology for Analyzing and Compiling Workbook Comments:***

A total of 386 workbooks were received during the public comment period in both electronic and hard copy formats. All workbooks were reviewed and are being considered during the alternatives development process. This document contains all public comments that suggested a new alternative option, provided a suggestion on how to improve an alternative option, or otherwise stated why an alternative option would or would not be effective in meeting the stated plan objectives. The comments are taken directly from the workbooks and are placed under selected effectiveness rating (definitely effective, may be effective, not effective) to provide context to the comment. Identical or duplicate comments on the same alternative option were not repeated in this compilation. A shorter summary of public comment received in the workbooks was also prepared and is available on the NPS Planning and Public Comment (PEPC) website.

### ***Background:***

On December 11, 2006 the National Park Service (NPS) published a Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for an Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan (Plan) for Cape Hatteras National Seashore, NC. Public input was solicited to determine the scope of issues to be addressed in the Plan/EIS and to identify significant issues related to ORV management at the Seashore. The NPS conducted four public scoping meetings and invited the public to send written comments to the Superintendent or to enter them on-line in the NPS Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) system. Public scoping began in February 2007, with meetings held in Buxton, North Carolina; Kill Devil Hills, North Carolina; Raleigh, North Carolina; and Washington, D.C.

In November 2007, the Seashore's interdisciplinary team met to develop preliminary alternative options. These options were derived from a combination of suggestions received from public scoping, current practices in other Seashore areas, and brainstorming of new ideas. To gather additional feedback on the preliminary alternative options they were summarized in a workbook format and made available for public comment.. The public was also encouraged to identify possible new alternative options. The workbooks were not designed as a survey tool or voting device but rather as a means of encouraging the public comment on whether the different options might or might not meet the objectives of the ORV management plan and how they could be improved.

### ***Alternatives Options Workbook Organization:***

Each workbook contained the following sections for public comment:

1. ORV Management
2. Education and Outreach
3. Law Enforcement
4. ORV Permits
5. Other ORV Management Issues
6. Species Protection
7. Site Specific Management: Bodie Island Ranger District
8. Site Specific Management: Hatteras Island Ranger District
9. Site Specific Management: Ocracoke island Ranger District

The following compilation of comments is presented in this same order. Within each of the sections in the workbook, multiple alternative options were listed. The options were not designed to be mutually exclusive, nor necessarily compatible, nor all inclusive. Some options appeared in more than one section of the workbook to enable commenters with an interest in one topic to go directly to that section and comment, skipping other sections if they chose. For each option, commenters were asked how effective they felt the alternative option would be in meeting the objectives of the plan. Commenters could choose from the following ratings: “definitely effective,” “may be effective,” or “not effective.” If a commenter chose “may be effective” or “not effective,” they were asked to further elaborate on why it would not be effective or to offer ideas on how the option could be improved to be more effective. At the end of each section, an additional area was provided for further comments, such as new options that were not suggested in the workbook.

The Alternatives Option Workbook was distributed to the public as follows:

- Copies were provided to participants at the January 3-4, 2008 meeting of the Negotiated Rulemaking Advisory Committee for ORV Management at Cape Hatteras National Seashore
- A press release, with the workbook as an attachment, was sent electronically to all recipients on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore ORV e-mail list
- Both Word and PDF versions of the workbooks were made available online on the NPS-PEPC website
- Hard copies of the workbook were distributed at a second round of public meetings held on January 14, 15, 16, and 17, in Buxton, Kill Devil Hills and Raleigh, North Carolina and in Richmond, Virginia, respectively, and provided to the public by the park when requested.

The public was asked to provide completed hard copy workbooks to the park or by email to [cahaorveis@louisberger.com](mailto:cahaorveis@louisberger.com) by February 15, 2008 (extended from the original January 30, 2008 date).

## *Compilation of Public Comments*

### **1. ORV Management**

#### **1.A. Designation of ORV Routes**

**1.A.1** Designate all existing ramps, interdunal roads, and beach corridors that are currently open to ORV use as ORV routes. (*status quo*)

##### **Definitely Effective**

- The existing ramps provide some access for ORV usage but with frequent closures for nesting activities, these access points diminish to very small areas. As a frequent user of the seashore I do not want to see the access diminish any further.
- Responsible use of ORVs under the current system can provide resource protection and traditional access
- Access for ORV use has already been constricted over the last 3 decades. More restrictions would certainly cause a negative fiscal impact on the communities along the CAHA due to visitors deciding not to take trips there. The economy of people that live in this area is dependent on visitors, many of whom (including myself) would choose not to visit with further restrictions.
- All of the ramps need to be opened including the ramps that were closed in the last 25 years.
- 1.A.1 is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003.

- Continue to close some routes as required by habitation
- Keep all existing ORV corridors open. Engage the public to help clean and protect these sensitive areas. Create a framework to help the public assist in the management goals and objectives.
- Believe there should be an emergency ramp at Oregon Inlet instead of cutting through dunes for large emergencies. Redevelop a ramp 20 so it may be used in the fall instead of the misuse that is occurring.

### **May Be Effective**

- There is a need for greater access around closed areas and closing due to beach and weather conditions.
- Existing ramps, interdunal roads, do not handle the volume of visitors during summer months. Beach corridors are not adequate and are sometimes restrictive with weather and beach closings. Additional interdunal roads are needed to allow passage around certain areas closed for resource protection and or safety. The status quo is somewhat effective and the rustic, undeveloped aspects are key attraction for tourists and visitors.
- May need to consider additional access points and interdunal roads to permit access to the changing environment. Would prefer to have all previously available ramps reopened.
- Status quo may be the best alternative; however, I have concerns with the narrow beach corridors. They should be widened greatly to prohibit vegetation growth.

### **Not Effective**

- ORVs have existing conflicts with non-orv users & resources – widely separate pedestrian and orv use and increase pedestrian access – give benefit of doubt to resource base.
- Existing (status quo) beach access are not adequate under normal conditions and are even more restrictive with the extreme changes of normal weather. Additional interdunal roads are needed to allow passage around areas closed for resource protection & safety.
- By not including ORV usage on the ocean side of the "Pea Island" portion of HI, plan is not meeting its purpose of "providing a variety of appropriate visitor use...."
- IF all existing ramps were open and functional, the situation would be much more fluent. The Ramp at the Point Campground, for example should be reopened.
- Additional interdunal access is needed to provide recreational opportunities and safe passage during periods of inclement weather and to allow for recreational uses while simultaneously providing access around areas set aside for protection of endangered and threatened species.
- The existing ramps are not adequate especially during high tide and severe weather(high winds).
- Reduce routes open to ORV access in order to meet stated objectives of the management plan.
- There are too many ramps. It makes it difficult for proper supervision and protection by NPS rangers. Some ramps are inappropriate at certain times of the year (ramp 49 when the campground is open) Ramp 43 is redundant with its close proximity to ramp 44. Hatteras Island would be easier to maintain, manage and patrol with 3 ORV access ramps, Bodie Island 1 access ramp, and Ocracoke 2 access ramps. 6 ramps could be maintained better and cheaper than the current number.
- No go for "status quo". The whole ORV system needs to be looked at to see is best for all concerns. This is not easy to do, will take time and \$\$'s, but needs to be looked at from top to bottom.

- The status quo has produced a National Seashore with no realistic habitat for Threatened or Endangered Species (T/E) to use for breeding and germination.
- 1.A.1 All Ramps and interdunal roads should be two lanes for safety reasons. Ramp 1 should be re-opened year around. An interdunal road should be established from Ramp 2 to Ramp 4. An interdunal road should be established from Ramp 4 to Oregon Inlet. Ramp 20 at the Rodanthe Pier should be re-opened seasonally. The interdunal road system between Ramps 23 and Ramp 34 should be re-opened with intermittent crossover roads to the beach. ORV access south of Ramp 38 should go further south past Haulover beach in the off season and replace the Ramp north of Buxton. The beach north of Ramp 43 should be re-opened for a full mile all year as it is not used by pedestrians and would reduce the concentration of visitors at Cape Point. Re-open the ramp at the lighthouse old site in the off season. Ramp 45 should be re-opened when the campground is closed. The interdunal road from Ramp 44 to east of Ramp 49 should be re-opened with several crossover access point roads to the beach. The ramp at the Frisco Pier should be re-opened in the off season and the beach re-opened to Ramp 55 in the off season. Pole Road must be two lanes wide again for safe passage and Spur road widened to two lanes. The beach from Ramp 59 west to Ramp 67 (which should be relocated to the east side of the parking lot) should be open year around to reduce the concentration at the inlet. The year around corridor system has only contributed to destroying bird habitat by allowing vegetation to proliferate. Year around closures and habitat maintenance do not go hand in hand. Hardcopy workbooks have incorrectly labeled maps and even corrected maps on web are misleading and still wrong. (comment repeated for 1.A.2)
- More ramps are needed to better handle the volume of traffic. This would reduce the crowding at each individual ramp and allow for enhanced access when weather conditions or extreme tides cause partial closures.

**(No Selection)**

- Existing ramps, interdunal roads, do not handle the volume of visitors. Beach corridors are not adequate under normal conditions and are even more restrictive with the extreme changes of weather. Additional interdunal roads are needed to allow passage around areas closed for resource protection and safety

**1.A.2** Reconfigure existing ORV access system by designating different, additional, or fewer ORV access ramps, interdunal roads and beach corridors as ORV routes.

**Definitely Effective**

- Additional access is needed to compensate for seasonal closures of beach areas for erosion, turtle and bird nesting, and pedestrian traffic.
- additional ramps or interdunal roads can provide additional resource protection and reduce conflicts where current corridors are often closed forcing users into smaller available space
- My only suggestion is that ORV access to Pea Island be reopened during a fall window when no birds or people would be affected. This would mean that a new access option would be needed for Pea Island access.
- By including all ORV accesses, plan will be its purpose of "providing a variety of appropriate visitor use..."
- Yes . We should open ramps 1 and 2 for public driving except in the summer months. Pea Island ramps should also be studied and selectively opened. We also need more access ramps b/w ramps 23-24. The Frisco pier area needs more ramps. Pls open ramp 45 near the CH campground and keep ramp 55 open as well.
- The need for more ramps is apparent by the amount of beach travel. More ramps would result in less travel on the beaches if one was closer to the area desired. More access ramps are needed from 20-34 and in the Frisco area.
- This would be very effective if more access ramps were constructed. Specifically between ramps 23-34. Additionally, if you were to reopen existing ramps such as ramp 45 it would be a step in the right direction.

- An additional ramp between ramp 30 and 34 as well as one between 34 and ramp 27 to insure safe ORV operation in high tide/narrow beach situations.
- We do need additional access ramps between ramps 23-34 and near Frisco pier. Reopen existing ramp 45 at the Cape Hatteras Campground.
- Need more access ramps, i.e. between Ramps 23 and 27, 27 and 30, 30 and 34, 49 and 55 or near the Frisco Pier. Open Ramps 1 and 45.
- The complete ORV access system should be reconfigured. The new system should maximize flexibility and alternative ORV access points through the use of an expanded ramp system, allowance for by pass or "go around" areas and a complete inter-dunal road system.

### **May Be Effective**

- Fewer access points and route will negatively impact all users and may cause an increase in adverse ecological impacts due to increased traffic and congestion..
- Some interdunal routes that could be used to bypass sections temporarily closed would allow access to other places not closed off. Example would be Cape Point and Hatteras Inlet interdunal roads can allow access or bypasses for certain closures while allowing access to other parts of the beach.
- The only improvement here would be to add more access ramps or re open access ramps that have over the past 30 some years been "temporary" closures. Over the past 30 years ORV access has been reduced severely causing many of the conflicts that exist today.
- Main problem with reducing access ramps is that the lesser number of ramps will increase traffic in the access areas. This will also increase fuel consumption and exhaust emissions which we all want to decrease, especially in the NC Seashore area.
- Should take into account time needed to transition to different ORV access system as well as need to educate users. 1.A.2. would not be effective as a alternative with an "overnight" implementation requirement. Reconfigured ORV access system should also consider grandfathering or exempting some existing uses or users.
- This should be done only on an as needed basis.
- fewer access points will require longer beach rides
- To maintain access after storm damage or during seasonal or safety closures different access ramps could be used to access the beach
- this could be used when dangerous conditions exist
- Reconfiguring could include exclusion of ORVs
- While 1.A.1 is preferred it may be advantageous to relocate or combine ramps or corridors from time to time that may have suffered storm or other damage.
- Additional ORV access points for use only when needed to maintain access to current normally open beach areas that would otherwise be inaccessible due to NPS temporary closure areas would be appropriate.
- Possibly rotating the access roads might reduce the effect on the environment. Presently not all access ramps are in use, parts of the National Seashore aren't open.
- Would be effective if more ramps were built to allow additional access, ie Restore ramp 45.
- Only if we have additional access, especially at Ramp 1 north of Coquina Beach.

- Open all interdunal roads that occasionally close and keep them open
- Between ramps 27-34 might need additional ramps depending on the way nesting & beach narrowing affect the current ramps. The same at ramp 55.
- Consider benefits of an Alternate 'taxi' service to be provided by NPS or NPS certified Private Contractors( shallow boat, ORV, etc ). This service would be designed to provide the best experience for the visitor(CUSTOMER) with the Best impact on our environment.
- Keep the current ramps open. If one or 2 must be temporarily or seasonally closed to meet objectives, then other options are there for ORV's.
- The management plan will not be effective, and probably not compliant, unless ORV access routes are reduced.
- Open ORV routes behind duneline and close routes in front of dunes in more sensitive areas
- Additional interdunal corridors would be effective to increase access when human access is hampered by resource closures. At times there is no access to the beach when there is even a small resource closure. Additional access ramps would also increase the accessibility to avoid resource closures. Fewer access ramps is not an option as it would reduce the amount of the park that was usable to patrons.
- Interdunal road need to be carefully considered and studied so as not to have negative consequences on resource and because of environmental concerns, no new interior or interdunal ORV trails should be constructed.
- Possibly different but a NO to fewer ramps. Hatteras Inlet road to the point should be redeveloped along with the dunes that were destroyed /overrun by previous hurricanes. NPS has been lax in rebuilding dunes only state road crews have been effective.
- May be effective if more accesses were added to spread crowding. For example during closed season a ramp could be added between Ram 49 and 55 at the west side of the restrooms and handicap ramp west of the Frisco Pier so traffic could access this area of beach. Also ramp 45 needs to be reopened when campground is closed.
- Fewer access ramps would mean longer distances would have to be driven on the beach, increasing the possible of damage to dunes, etc.
- Access to and from the areas that I fish have been sufficient for my purposes. Implementation of new additional access ramps would be counter productive and costly
- Access to soundside on Pole Road near Hatteras would be a good example of better access points, as the ones there now are needlessly closed.
- Should existing roads or corridors become impassable due to water or dry sand, poles (bamboo/fiberglass) with painted tops could be used to direct ORV use. Signs at ramps for color-coded designation. Ramp closures should be minimal.
- Increasing access and interdunal roads may relieve congestion especially during times of restricted access secondary to protected species.

### **Not Effective**

- Our experience at Cape Cod National Seashore is that once a trail or access point was temporary closed it was in effect permanently closed and next to impossible to re-open. Caution should be used in this area! Alternate access points to alleviate closures due to resource management have been impossible to implement here thereby forcing total closures with no alternatives.
- Should not be done on a permanent basis. Only as needed such as piping plover or turtle nesting, etc.

- This proposal is not in keeping with Designation as National Recreational area
- There are not enough ramps as of now, fewer would just add to the congestion
- Current access areas are appropriate for current use
- Ramps that have been closed i.e. 45 need to be reopened, additional access needs to be available in the Frisco area. There needs to be expanded access not less. Beach corridors need to be wider, I have experienced NPS personal move the beach corridor further out which prevented safely passing. The explanation was the birds need more room!
- The only thing I'm concerned with in this question/language is the word "fewer." In my mind, that would more than likely lead to less access. My vote has to do with different or additional, and not "fewer" ramps.
- Work with what is now available. Increasing and/or decreasing accesses only adds to the problem of decision making
- More access ramps are needed between ramps 23-34. Reopen closed existing ramps ex. 45 Having more and better located access ramps will significantly cut down on traffic in the beach corridor since people will have more direct access to their beach destination.
- The current access areas allow plenty of access to beaches for commercial and recreational use. Lowering the number of access points could lead to excessive concentrations of traffic in specific areas.
- This would only be effective if the reconfiguration provided additional areas for ORV use opening additional areas to fishing. This would accommodate more visitors and add to the economy of the towns and villages of the CAHA. Use of ORV's in a responsible manner causes no long term impact to the resource. If an area is closed on a temporary basis, impacts will be eliminated within a matter of days.
- This will take time and money to study different, additional or fewer ORV access ramps, interdunal roads and beach corridors. The existing roads and ramps have been in use for many years and have been altered by hurricanes. I feel existing ORV roads, access and interdunal roads are fine and take into account all conservation efforts.
- I've been surf fishing at the OBX for the last 25 years and feel that the current number of ramps is adequate. I believe that either increasing or decreasing the number of ramps will not improve the current condition but create future problems relative to beach management by the NPS and hostility by ORV owners.
- 1.A.2 can only be effective if the access system provides additional ramps or alternative routes (interdunal roads) as by passes for resource and safety closures. This is necessary because of the decreasing amount of access provided as a result of Superintendent's Order No. 7 and the Interim Plan.
- The number of access ramps should not be reduced. If the number of access points are reduced, this will cause an increase in traffic to the remaining access points and will most likely increase the amount of erosion to the remaining access points. Maybe this should be restated that there will not be any increase in the number of current access points.
- Different, or additional may be effective. Fewer ORV access ramps would increase wear and erosion at the sites as well as increased congestion leading to ORV's leaving existing corridors to avoid the congestion. It would also increase travel distances on beach corridors, again impacting wear on these corridors.
- The current layout and number of roads, corridors and ramps is sufficient
- As a dynamic geologic natural resource. Habitat needed for successful natural breeding and germination of T/E species is likely to, and need to, change seasonally.

## **1.B. Designation of Passive Recreation and Resource Protection Areas**

**1.B.1** Continue with current options for ORVs and pedestrians (ORVs and pedestrians are prohibited in all resource closures. Seasonal and safety closures exclude ORVs but allow pedestrian use (*status quo*)).

### **Definitely Effective**

- System now balances all concerns with the minimal disruption possible.
- Is effectively working at this time.
- This should not preclude NPS from moving resource closures, e.g. turtles
- Current protection efforts should continue. However more appropriate formulas should be used to determine how much of a resource needs to be closed.
- no reason why the groups cannot share the same areas together
- Fencing at parking areas should be configured so pedestrians have to walk by signage explaining resource & other types of closures before they can get to the beach
- 1.B.1 is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003.
- I am fine with current resource closure rules (status quo) as long as all access ramps are not closed at the same time
- Effective at present but closing of beaches to orv use because homeowners believe the beach in front of their home is their beach is not a viable reason to close esp. in off season.
- Not all resource closures need to extend to the water line, there has been a ridiculous amount of this over the past couple of years. You are depriving the park users access to the very Ocean they come here to enjoy! This too is a safety issue for those in trouble in the water, but they can't come ashore or they get a ticket!

### **May Be Effective**

- Could help preserve areas and endangered species, but limits and concentrates more beach users in smaller areas.
- To be highly effective, more effort should be placed on opening areas as soon as possible, and expanding other areas to compensate for seasonal closures.
- If an area is closed it is closed to everyone but NPS personal who should be visually identifiable
- May be effective if the resource closures are promptly reopened when the area is no longer sustaining a nesting population of the protected species.
- More closely look at pedestrian access allowance. May need to be further restricted.
- Add signs to further define usage at the point of entry
- All gov't and NPS personnel that enter the closures need to be readily identifiable to the visitors. (bright-colored vests should be worn)

- The only change to the status quo that I would recommend is for NPS personnel to wear easily identifiable clothing such as bright orange vests so that visitors don't mistakenly enter one of these protected areas thinking that it is okay for folks to enter because they saw someone already in the area. Inly to find out the hard way, that it is a NPS officer in the enclosed area and not a visitor or pedestrian.
- It is disconcerting to observe persons in the resource closures who may have a legitimate reason for being there without some means for the observer to determine that in fact the persons do have a legitimate reason for the intrusion.
- Safety closures should not be used for ORVs. It should be travel at your own risk.
- If safety closures are eliminated. Let me judge. If dunes/vegetation are abused in narrow places, then enforcement (tickets) should come before closure.
- Some areas should include pedestrian corridors as they may not impact resource protection and may be implemented to allow access to fishing, surfing, and kiting areas. Pedestrians should continue to have access to seasonal /safety closures
- HAS WORKED FAIRLY WELL SINCE I'VE BEEN VISITING STARTING IN MID 80'S, BUT BETTER SIGNAGE OR OTHER MEANS OF COMMUNICATION IS NEEDED.
- Resource closures should prohibit both ORV and Pedestrian access. There is clear scientific evidence that informs managers that shore birds are even more disturbed by Pedestrian traffic than vehicle traffic. Other types of ORV closures should allow passive access and some should not. The current system should be better defined so that it is well understood by the public
- Resource, Seasonal and safety closures are appropriate. Guidelines should be more formally documented. Areas such as the Frisco beach are currently closed year round rather than seasonally, even though the beach is safe enough for both ORV and passive use to accommodate off-season ORV use.
- Rules should provide guidelines for safety closures and reopening as well. As the years have gone by, we've seen "safety closures" become permanent, even in face of change in conditions making the beach now safe. (South of Frisco pier is excellent example of this.)

### **Not Effective**

- In the Glossary, "passive recreation" includes fishing, but does not include motorized activities. This distinction ignores reality, as most recreational beach fishing involves some amount of beach driving in an ORV to a surfside location to engage in the passive "fishing". This limitation makes this I.B.I. alternative unlikely to be effective.
- We need to educate folks to be more careful in these areas and police them not prohibit them
- Insufficient evidence to know if the status quo is working. Data used in the pending lawsuit would indicate the answer is Not Effective, but current effects need to be measured or assessed
- If the area is closed to ORV traffic, then it needs to be closed to pedestrian traffic as well. The area is closed for protection. If the NPS is the only personnel allowed in area, then it needs to be clearly marked AND enforced. NPS Personnel should be easily identified as NPS personnel.
- Current options discourage pedestrian use in most areas of the National Seashore because of user conflicts between motorized vehicles and pedestrians.
- Areas must be Vehicle-Free (VF) during prebreeding and early breeding times or the park will continue to neglect it's responsibilities for protecting T/E species.

- There are present closures that are called safety closures that are being held closed for this process. NPS must never forget that the beach in front of villages and houses that are beach front are not private beaches for these ocean front houses and must be opened in off season for users. Many more off road visitors visit during shoulder seasons and should be better accommodated as in past years before these issues re-appeared
- Boundaries can and should change from week to week and year to year. Not sure that non-adjustable would work in a majority of cases

**1.B.2** Provide predictability for visitors by designating ORV and passive recreation use areas with non-adjustable boundaries.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Having areas for wildlife protection and pedestrians that are predetermined is a definite bonus, and provides options for chosen different uses of the resource.
- Do away with seasonal and non-seasonal areas, decide on an equal allocation between the two access groups (passive and motorized) then make it formal.

### **May Be Effective**

- Predictability would be an improvement but boundaries need to be seasonally adjusted.
- The nature of the islands make it hard to have "predictable" areas. This may make some of the management easier, and cut down on people being in the wrong place due to confusion.
- In the Glossary, "passive recreation" includes fishing, but does not include motorized activities. This distinction ignores reality, as most recreational beach fishing involves some amount of beach driving in an ORV to a surfside location to engage in the passive "fishing". This limitation makes this 1.B.1. alternative unlikely to be effective.
- May be effective providing that the amount of beach accessed isn't reduced.
- Passive recreation area should only be used for life guarded beaches.
- Add signs to further define usage at the point of entry
- Places like Coquina, the light house beach are permanent closures with lifeguards on duty in-season now. More signage could help point this out. Are the parking lots large enough?
- I would like to see parking areas for passive recreation similar to Pea Island. These should be ORV free areas. There are not enough of these.
- This may work only if ORV use is curtailed significantly.
- If more areas are upgraded for passive recreation. Areas such as parking, walkovers, etc.
- Not in agreement with creating the "passive recreation" designation EXCEPT for lifeguarded beaches. In the alternative, if the "P-R" designation is created, then include the area S. of Ramp 38 (closed for years) to Buxton as a "P-R" area.
- 1.B.1, 1.B.2, 1.B.3 and 1.B.4 cannot be mutually exclusive. The current closure at the old lighthouse site and the beach immediately south is appropriate year round. Closures at the tri-village, Avon, Buxton, Frisco, Hatteras Village areas should not be permanent but should be governed by Seasonal and safety closure guidelines.

### **Not Effective**

- Conditions are dynamic and closures and limitations need to be flexible.
- In cases where resource management adjustments need to be made non-adjustable boundaries would prohibit simple moves that could allow continued use.
- Because of seasonal changes in erosion, wildlife nesting and visitor population changes.
- Non adjustable boundaries is not acceptable, you can not predict the usage of any of the areas of the Seashore accurately and would be unfair to all users.
- Closure areas should be seasonally flexible and based on beach and wildlife conditions
- Does not allow for seasonal closures
- nesting areas and turtle nesting areas need to be protected during appropriate times not all times
- This proposal is not in keeping with Designation as National Recreational area.
- It is a seashore and the landscape changes - rigid boundaries could cause havoc with visitors
- Conditions change and flexibility must be retained.
- The boundaries should not be changed frequently and only when necessitated by physical changes that make areas currently open physically impossible to access. These lands are naturally in a constant state of change.
- Passive recreation areas should be life guarded beaches only
- Again...I'm cautious about the non-adjustable boundaries statement. Who would determine the non-adjustable boundaries? It doesn't sound very negotiable to me.
- It is impossible to predict where a turtle will lay her eggs, or a bird will build a nest. The current system manages these events as they occur.
- This option eliminates the ability to manage the resource.
- In my opinion the NPS does a poor job in providing access for passive recreation. I don't see this as being an advantageous option for park visitors.
- If various nesting birds/turtles use the same exact areas year after year this could be a viable option otherwise individual areas need to be assigned to suit both wildlife and human use.
- Such rigidity is counter-intuitive. The resources are too vital and subject to change to set anything in "concrete."
- Separating ORV and passive recreation areas is divisive and establishes user conflicts. The entire park is one recreational area. Exclude ORV's where endangered species are currently located (nesting season).
- With the exception of seasonal closures in the villages, all other closures should be as needed.
- Beach and dune lines are constantly changing in a manner that is unpredictable. "non adjustable boundaries" would be just that, "non adjustable" Certain predictability is already part of the status quo. Visitors know that there are seasonal closures to ORV in front of the villages during the summer vacation season.
- It is hoped that passive recreation will be all up and down the beach. Marking an ORV "roadway" does not make sense because of changing tidelines and dunelines

- Allow vehicles direct access to the water in areas such as Buxton Point, Hatteras Inlet, Oregon Inlet. These three areas are primary for ORV access. On north beaches such as between ramp 23-34 a corridor properly marked, with stake borders, allowing pedestrian usage of the beach outside of the borders. All of these boundaries should have adjusted to meet the needs of wildlife protection, and have access around said wildlife.

**1.B.3** Provide flexibility by designating ORV and passive recreation use areas with adjustable boundaries (e.g. if an ORV route is closed temporarily because of a full beach resource closure, the park could temporarily extend ORV use into a nearby passive recreation area to help offset the closure).

### **Definitely Effective**

- Attention should be placed on equalizing access areas by opening closed areas (portions of Pea Island for example) to compensate for temporary closures.
- this may help reduce user conflict
- would surely offset negative responses about the Park Service
- 1.B.3 Given the dynamic nature of CHNSRA's beaches, access options will always be unpredictable. The only way to provide adequate access for All types of users is to allow the NPS to respond to the changing environment by adjusting boundaries when needed.
- USERS NEED INFO ON ACCESS AREAS AND CHANGES. USE OF MODERN ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION (EMAIL, TEXT MSG., LOCAL ACCESS CABLE, ETC.) PLUS SIGNAGE WILL BE HELPFUL.
- Yes. Example areas around Avon. Closures near the ramps with open areas between them were inaccessible to anyone. Two ¼ mile closures would effectively close miles of “open” beach. If there were alternate routes these areas would be available for visitor use.
- Due to WX, ramp 43 and 44 are sometimes flooded. By opening the lighthouse access ramp the point area can be accesses safely.
- All of these corridors should be adjustable with regard to beach erosion.
- Example is to adjust the boundary of the seasonal closure N. of Ramp 43 (which extends to Lighthouse Beach) to extend ORV use in or into a portion of that “passive recreation” area to help offset a closure and either avoid or ease overcrowding.
- Temporary full beach resource closures should be expected from time to time. Temporary traffic detours through normally passive recreation areas are appropriate. The recent detour at the north side of Cape Point is a good example.

### **May Be Effective**

- Flexibility is a must. Visitors are willing to work with reasonable rules that allow access
- This may be a effective alternative if a full beach closure is put in place and an equal and nearby area could be opened for ORV and passive recreational use.
- Life guarded beaches should not be flexible during the season
- Any such changes should be temporary and should return to the normally established and published boundaries as soon as possible. Any change in boundaries should not change the percentage of CHNS beach open to ORV. Any such plan should also have as a stated requirement an objective to maintain ORV access to those areas that contain physical features most desirable for fishing, swimming, beachcombing, bird watching etc.

- Perhaps worth a try if passive recreation areas are increased in number and accessibility.
- There should be flexibility built into any plan, I would prefer that more flexibility be available to keep an ORV route open verse encroaching a passive recreation area.
- Good option but not into life guarded areas during the summer time.
- Add signs to further define usage at the point of entry
- Boundary creep into otherwise closed areas is a great idea when possible, but should not be allowed into life guarded beaches in the summertime.
- This seems like a good compromise between different user groups. I believe incorporation of additional ORV access during seasonal times would be a good addition to this option.
- If more than what is listed in 1.b.2 are needed they should be flexible
- This is the type of compromise that will keep everybody happy. It will not be much of a burden for the passive users for if the passive recreation areas are not near housing areas, they will not be very busy areas. Flexibility is important
- This may be effective in certain places and not in others. I don't believe this would work in the village areas with seasonal closures but adjustable boundaries are essential and necessary in non populated areas such as Cape Point and Oregon, Hatteras, and Ocracoke inlets. Resource protection closures should be able to be bypassed by adjustable boundaries and additional interdunal corridors which will allow beach users to access the beach.
- This is a good example of a flexible boundary, however, this philosophy can easily be manipulated depending on administrative direction in the future. In order to establish that the intension of this flexibility is to maximize access, firm, understandable and as close to automatic guidelines for flexibility must be included in the development of this option. Sunset provisions on all restrictions must be clear.

### **Not Effective**

- creates conflict when not enforced properly and enforcement has been a big problem in the past also alerting the groups as to what is closed and open and to who will be a problem
- If there were to be separately designated areas, I don't believe that adjustable boundaries that would benefit one group at the disadvantage of the other would be acceptable. This would apply in either application, ORV or passive recreation.
- Do not reopen passive areas to ORV use once designated
- This has been tried throughout the park for the past 10 years. Numerous user conflicts have occurred.
- ORV and passive use are inherently conflicting. Documentary and anecdotal evidence has already proved this. There is not enough space for passive users. They are discouraged from going to beaches where there are noisy, motorized vehicles.
- Passive recreational users deserve equal consideration to the resource and to staging areas that provide adequate safe parking in vicinity of quality areas of the Park with exceptional resources, and attributes, not just areas that are unsuitable for beach driving. Low visitor use times (winter) are just as important to passive users as ORV users, set the access boundaries and leave them in place. In addition it will be easier to manage for NPS law rangers.
- Better to begin education of public to the needs of breeding and germinating T/E species. At this time, with so few possibilities of T/E breeding or germination, creating more VF beaches and related habitat seems to be the only real chance for the return of T/E species due to over use by ORVs.

#### **1.B.4** Redefine areas open to ORVs and pedestrians on a seasonal or year-round basis.

##### **Definitely Effective**

- With exception of areas closed near housing areas to provide safety, all Hatteras Island beaches should be open for access.
- As conditions require change
- There should be definite defined use areas during the summer season but after but access should be granted in off-season to ORV's for fishing.
- This should be simple for all involved with clear signage

##### **May Be Effective**

- This is where predictability will help addressed in 1.B.2. Knowing that certain areas are closed or open during certain dates helps cut down on confusion and provides some give and take.
- If year round but not seasonal
- Defined areas for ORV access have existed for many years. The problem occurs when they are closed with little or no basis or explanation.
- Add signs to further define usage at the point of entry
- Are these to be permanent, or are you going to keep changing them?
- Existing defined areas for ORVs are presently open to pedestrians and need to remain open to ORVs
- Please place emphasis on pre-existing ORV access areas that have been closed with little or no explanation
- This may be effective if the entire beach including but not limited to Pea Island are in consideration. If this is considered, I recommend that the negotiating body start with the boundaries set when the seashore was established. All of the beach was open then as opposed to part of it as it is now.
- Only if 1.A.2. is used as the guide. T/E species need to be the focus, not the economic value of ORVs to the area economy. With the return of a protected habitat there will be more economic benefits.

##### **Not Effective**

- This method sounds like it would cause a great deal of confusion for users and limit access so severely that it could cause even more conflict.
- It is unlikely this option can be administered effectively enough to avoid recurring allegations by one special interest group or another that the redefined areas or times of year are selected by NPS arbitrarily and capriciously.
- Current restrictions and closures are adequate.
- Too much uncertainty
- The season for the entire area is year round

- Again, this takes away from your ability to manage the resource. As conditions change you need the flexibility to change management rules also. We are in an area that has hurricanes which can change a lot of things quickly.
- I believe that all areas should be open to all user groups except in cases that warrant seasonal, safety or nesting closures.
- Too rigid. Resources not stable enough for such redefinitions. Must be subject to changes—both for ORVs and for pedestrians (and for wildlife).
- Unnecessary. ORV areas are quite clearly defined.
- Why redefine areas open on a seasonal basis or year round. This should only be done if a natural disaster strikes our coast then it is warranted to redefine areas due to changing topographical features.
- Don't take more from the ORVs. Pedestrians have closed beaches in Pea Island, Buxton, Frisco-Hatteras now, if anything give some of that back to ORV.
- 1.B.4 The current split between passive use and ORV use areas, provides adequate access for ALL types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15.
- Too restrictive and too much subject to “special interest” groups influencing the designations.
- Pedestrian currently have no designated year round passive areas. Year round passive use areas are important to passive users. Do away with seasonal and non-seasonal areas and don't change the boundaries with change of seasons or changes in visitation.

**1.B.5** Develop and define consistent names for designations of closures (e.g., seasonal closure, safety closure, resource closure).

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Allows users to understand NPS announcements.
- This would make enforcement and record keeping simpler and more importantly increase the understanding by the public.
- As long as efforts are made to open other areas to compensate for closed areas.
- The public needs to know reasons for closures.
- over time this should help users understand where closures are in effect.
- Though closures should be limited and not done extensively.
- A little communication goes a long way. If people are aware of the reason behind the closure, frustration levels will be much lower.
- Simple definition, purpose and expected duration of closure would be very helpful to all interested. Proper record keeping and posting are essential.
- This is an absolute necessity. Suggest resource closure is legally supported and accurately established.
- It would be simpler to use just 4 types of closures: **ORV safety closure** (pedestrians allowed), **No entry safety closure** (like during hurricanes) **Resource closure with pedestrian corridor**, and **Resource closure, all entry prohibited**

- Post the definitions on the ORV Access Website.
- Consistently and clear definitions, along with the necessary criteria that will be used to designate the closures is vital! Must also clearly define the length of time the closures will be in effect.

### **May Be Effective**

- Make closures make sense. Example 1 Do not close areas where there is nothing to protect.
- It is unlikely this option can be administered effectively enough to avoid recurring allegations by one special interest group or another that the redefined areas or times of year are selected by NPS arbitrarily and capriciously. To foster confidence in the selection process, these names and their definitions would be very critical to all stakeholders.
- Consistency would appear to be minimal requirement
- Area residents will know what is what while occasional visitors will not understand any of the terminology. If funds are limited, this is not a high priority.
- I for one would like to know why I will be adjusting my recreational time.
- It would be nice to know why a specific area is closed at a given time
- A common language around closures and what this would mean would help all involved
- Will aid public understanding of NPS reasoning but overall may not offer much: better to establish if for no other reason then to enhance communication and understanding

### **Not Effective**

- What you call a closure is meaningless if the reason for the closure is weak. An example would be closing the Point because a Plover was observed doing a mating dance. Who's going to care what that type of closure is called?
- We have a consistent set of designations. If there is any inconsistency, it is in the application of these closures. Seasonal and resource closures should adhere to Superintendent's Order No. 7 and the Interim Plan. Safety closures should be eliminated--travel at your own risk has never resulted in personal injury for those who adhere to the speed limit. If safety closures remain they must be applied on a case by case basis using common sense (i.e. a narrow flat beach may be easily navigated while a beach with a steep grade may require more width to navigate).
- A closure is a closure. What this means to visitors is "you can't use the beach" A visitor using a weeks vacation doesn't care weather it's a safety closure or a resource closure. They're spending their money to visit an open park and they expect and deserve to be able to access it.

## **1C. Consistent Management Approach for Beaches in Front of Villages**

**1.C.1** Continue May 15 – September 15 seasonal ORV closures in front of all villages. (*status quo*)

### **Definitely Effective**

- Seasonal closures are acceptable now.
- This will help all visitors to enjoy the resources with ORV's or without.
- Demonstrated reduction of pedestrian /orv conflicts

- Do not see a need for ORV access in this area during the summer months.
- Safety issue. And provides access for beach goers that feel ORV use is an annoyance. Most people have an idea of what the beach should be like and most have different opinions
- Allows good separation of pedestrians and OVR
- Frisco & Hatteras have to be included in the areas opened off-season.
- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for ALL types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15.
- ORVs should be banned in front of all villages as a safety hazard.
- Definitely to many people on beach for ORV use
- This common practice has been in effect for the 30+ years that I've been going to Hatteras island and is well understood and effective.
- My family has owned a vacation home in Avon since the 1970s. The current seasonal closures work well.
- NPS database figures show that visitation goes down outside of these dates. Reduced and enforced speed limits in front of villages can deal with concerns of safety of the few beach users. Thanksgiving and Easter village closures may be effective.
- These closures are necessary for the owners of these properties during the tourist season. That being said, in the case of dates after September 15 and before May 15 all areas behind villages, with the exception of beach erosion closures, access should be allowed to pedestrians and ORVs. There is no reason to close these areas of access behind villages outside of the tourist season.

### **May Be Effective**

- I would not be in favor of any policy that limits access in any area that would benefit one group and penalize another
- From a safety standpoint this is effective. However, impacts to access areas should be mitigated by opening areas on Pea Island that would not impact wildlife.
- This should a function of public usage, not necessarily dates
- Closures in front of villages should be a function of activity. Safety is paramount, but if beaches are mostly unused, there is no reason to restrict access.
- effective only when all species have fledged or hatched
- Perhaps extend dates outward
- May not be practical based on conditions and/or species to be protected
- What happens when continued development occurs?
- Appropriate in some villages like Nags Head and not in others like Avon.

- Each beach section needs to be looked at. Some sections might not get any pedestrian traffic and be available for other uses. Beaches with pedestrian traffic should have limited or restricted vehicle access.
- Until villages place parking and access ramps to beach for public use, ORV closures should not be allowed.
- Seasonal closures of this nature are a good management tool. Dates should be flexible and based on actual concentrations of visitor use. Criteria for closures and criteria for automatic opening should be included in the plan

### **Not Effective**

- The status quo on this point is part of the reason for the debate.
- Preset time limitations are easier to plan around
- The recreational beaches of the Cape Hatteras park are open to all visitors and should not become the private domain of the oceanfront landowners. If visitors want beaches for pedestrians only, then they can visit elsewhere
- Lower beach speed in villages.
- This should be looked at on some of the southern beaches the beach stays empty were the villages are. All the people that stay there drive to the ORV ramps
- This is not fair to those visitors who expect closures during the season.
- The status quo is antiquated management from the past and fails to address Park Management Policies and **Executive Orders 11644 and 11989**, the Cape Hatteras Enabling Legislation and current visitor needs. National park management should not change because seasons change.

**1.C.2** Adjust May 15 – September 15 seasonal ORV closures in front of all villages to decrease time of closure.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Present closure of May 15 to Sept 15 should be maintained to protect families with children. This time period is sufficient for summer family vacations

### **May Be Effective**

- The closures in front of the villages during the summer months has been accepted by park users as the norm. This time frame gives the users the maximum summer usage.
- I don't think it is as effective as village-specific management, but this would be better than 1.C.1.
- If impact on villages is minimal.
- If this would help to bring harmony between the groups it would be in the best interest to all to find a schedule or schedules that would be a good compromise.
- Memorial Day through Labor Day should be the closure period which will accommodate the beach goer
- should be based on tourist visitation or occupancy rates. visitation rates may be greatly reduced after Labor Day and may not pick-up until Memorial Day. if that's the case, why not extend ORV use?
- Perhaps with resource based decision making
- Closures from May 30 to September 1 would be adequate

- If further closure limited to 1 May to 31 Sep, consistent with Nags Head and other Northern beaches but I see little justification for even this extension.
- NCDOT changes the speed limits in the villages to accommodate increased visitation and safety concerns. It stands to reason that NPS would follow suit with seasonal closures. There cannot possibly be more traffic on the beaches than there is on the highway!.

### **Not Effective**

- As a property owner in the village of Avon I feel the May to Sept. closure is working and should not be adjusted.
- Pedestrian traffic is heavy at all hours during this period.
- Pedestrian use of these areas is at it's peak during this time of year. Reducing pedestrian access and expanding ORV access would only lead to user group conflict.
- This may have a negative impact on the visitor's experience.
- Decreasing the closers time is not needed and could lessen the non ORVer vacation.
- Seasonal closure is fine as long as the beaches are OPENED off-season. There are no good reasons not to open these beaches off-season.
- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for ALL types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15.
- People with houses in those areas in the summer would not like the ORV's up and down the beach.
- Village beach areas must remain closed to ORV access (except essential use vehicles) at all times for safety reasons, as well as to avoid user conflict and legal liability.
- Definitely to many people on beach for ORV use
- Do away with seasonal closures. Passive areas should be available year round, they have the same value to all user groups, no matter what the season. ORV driving is just as important to ORV users in the summer as the winter the same is true with passive recreational users
- No need for change. Off-season businesses, which need the ORV, use as much as possible, have lived with these closures and they need not be shortened. They also coincide with Hwy 12 speed limit changes that have worked for years.
- Decreasing time of closure does not address safety concerns as the seasonal use of the park and beaches expands.
- Beaches should be closed during high cottage occupancy times
- Use school calendar to determine summer closures in front of villages

**1.C.3** Expand duration of seasonal ORV closures in front of all villages (e.g., from May 1 – October 15).

### **Definitely Effective**

- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15

### **May Be Effective**

- I don't think it is as effective as village-specific management, but this would be better than 1.C.1.
- Maybe not these exact dates, but looking at some alternate dates may be a positive to meet objectives if the current May 15 to Sept. 15 doesn't currently meet them.
- Unnecessary restriction of resources.
- Not needed and would limit uses without reason.
- When schools start, the beaches become void of pedestrians.
- Effective only if ORVs are banned from village beachfronts.

### **Not Effective**

- As a property owner in the village of Avon I feel the May to Sept. closure is working and should not be adjusted.
- By the end of August ORV usage does not conflict with other user groups in front of the villages. May 15-September 15 is one third of the year.
- Public usage is greatest between June 15 and Sept 1.
- Based on rental occupancy and visitor data additional seasonal closure is not justifiable.
- The current times are adequate to cover increased usage during the prime summer season
- Memorial Day through Labor Day should be the closure period which will accommodate the beach goer
- why extend if rental/hotel occupancy rates do not warrant.
- Most sun bathers, swimmers, etc are gone after Labor Day
- This expansion is not desired or warranted. The occupancy and number of visitors dramatically decreases in the shoulder season pre memorial day and post labor day.
- Pedestrian use of these areas is past it's peak during latter part of this time period. Reducing ORV access and expanding pedestrian access would only lead to user group conflict.
- Not unless the visitor traffic utilizing the beach areas increases and warrants extending dates.
- Probably not acceptable to the local residents and guests. Examine less rigid alternatives
- This is not necessary based on information from rental agencies and visitor use in the off season.
- Not needed based on rentals and visitor data
- As in 1.c.2 above the seasonal time is OK, but Frisco & Hatteras need to be included in areas opened off-season.
- They are fine as they are now, but passive users should have their own "ramps" or beach access areas away from the villages like Pea Island.
- I like driving in front of a house that we rented in the first week of Oct.

- The four month summer if family time. Children are back in school by Sept.15, so there is no need to extend the closure time.
- Do away with seasonal closures. Passive areas should be provided year round.
- The dates do not have any particular importance.
- Beaches are not used by vacationers these months; passive visitation goes way down, and fall fishing is on the rise
- This would lead to expanding the closure areas, and limit access. Would move beach access out of the vacation time frame and into general beach usage
- the majority of visitors come between the end and beginning of school
- My personal experience shows “enough” visitors to village areas in the “off-season” that these areas should be free of ORV use as long as possible
- This would discourage early fall & spring visitation by those that come for the ORV driving experience and seasonal fishing. Local economic well being depends on these visitors.

#### 1.C.4 Establish year-round ORV closures on the beach in front of the villages.

##### **Definitely Effective**

- Could limit access for those not having beach front property
- Year-round ORV closures on the beach in front of the villages have proven to be a valid management option from the past. Some areas of the Park have been off limit to ORV use in excess of 25 years with few management or access problems and no economic impact to the community. Many visitors have come to expect and value year round passive areas,. Passive recreational areas have positive economic benefits to the community.

##### **May Be Effective**

- May be effective to reach harmony between groups and the main thing to consider with closures in front of villages is safety of everyone, not "who owns the beach"
- Why should this be done? Who benefits or is harmed by this type of closure?
- This may be a compromise that needs to be made as long as it does not hurt the local economy during the off season.

##### **Not Effective**

- At this time there is no danger to beach erosion, wildlife habitats or nesting areas that this would address. There is no need to close beaches to ORV traffic year-round.
- As an ORV user I do not want to see any more year round or permanent closures, we have already lost enough access.
- Worst case scenario - fails to take into account all potential users
- It would close portions of the beach for no reason.... no breeding, no pedestrians and more fishermen in a smaller area

- The beaches are not private. They are public. They do not belong to the property owners or renters. The status quo practice of closing these beaches during the summer season is to accommodate the NON-ORV visitor during the season. To close these areas after the season will only have a negative economic impact on the area during the off season. The economy depends on the ORV attraction during the off-season.
- I have fished within village boundaries during Oct. tournament and have never been near pedestrians. If the beach had become crowded I would have moved on.
- Probably not acceptable to the villages, though it may be worth exploring. It would eliminate one of the problems—ORVs
- There is no access to passive recreation in the villages because of private property.
- Unnecessary - off season ORV usage helps with policing the areas
- The resource belongs to all the people and is not the property of home owners, beaches should remain accessible during the off season as defined above.
- The beaches are not private in front of these locations and belong to the public. The existing closures support non ORV visitors while allowing ORV access during the "off season"
- This effectively shuts out fishermen
- Many of the beaches are deserted in Jan/Feb, etc..... no need to close to ORV.
- Not necessary during times of low pedestrian use
- This will prevent HANDICAPPED access as it is prevented now in Frisco & Hatteras
- Year round closures in front of the villages serve one purpose only--to limit off-season access to otherwise deserted beaches. See pictures in attached (LUIZER) "Additional Comments\_off season use".
- Would recommend local village input and strongly recommend consideration of reasons of beach use. Is village in area of predominately fishing use during off season?
- Please don't assume that the beaches in front of the 7 villages are the same
- This would render the majority of the park to be inaccessible. It's called an "off season" for a reason. The only people on the beach are visitors and residents that are fishing. There are no "family vacationers, lying on the beach" during this time. Year round closures would be unacceptable and would cripple the local economy that relies on beach access to draw fishermen/fisherwomen to the area.
- Do not even think about it!!!!!! I am at Salvo and I do not want that. I am there because I can drive on the beach in the off season. I would rather sell and go some where else if I cannot drive and esp. if I cannot drive my paralyzed son onto the beach. Plus you play into the hands of the rich and not the common man!!!!!!
- North Carolina law guarantees beach access as a public right. Homeowners do not own the beach in front of or behind their properties.
- Closed beaches at the villages are intended to accommodate non-ORV beach users during the summer/seasonal months (Memorial Day to Labor Day) and they adequately do that. Year round closure privatizes the beaches for home owners only. Not realistic use as national recreational park/public use

**[No Selection]**

- Only if safety warrants it.

**1.C.5** Expand passive recreation areas for a set distance (e.g., 1/2 mile or 1 mile) on either side of each village to provide pedestrians access to undeveloped non-ORV areas.

**Definitely Effective**

- Expand passive year round recreation areas on either side of the villages.

**May Be Effective**

- This may help to allow tourists to experience more natural areas of the beach which are only touched by feet, plus allowing more areas with low impact for wildlife.
- In the context of village-specific management this makes a good deal of sense, and in a consistent approach (all villages) is much better than 1.C.4.
- If done only during the seasonal ORV season
- Support with additional visitor use data
- This may be a safety issue and not a good idea.
- If it is outside of the village areas, then any safety concerns are mitigated. These area should be open to pedestrian and ORV usage equally.
- This could be effective in-season if parking lots are built for the non-beachfront visitors to use.
- This is also a compromise that may need to happen even though it is ORV restrictive.
- Effective only of passive recreation is the only permitted use for a longer stretch than 1 mile.
- As long as this is decided by the residents and local govt of each village.
- May be effective if kept to ¼ mile as Most people are not willing to walk beyond the point that they came on especially those with kids. However another problem arises in that this would be out of the protective zones that can be watched by lifeguards which than again be quite dangerous.
- Apparently a good idea but many ORV ramps, eg Avon, would fall within the zone and would either have to be closed or re-created at another location. Losing existing ramps is not an acceptable option

**Not Effective**

- Many ORV areas are small already.
- Pedestrian visitors in the villages are mostly renting beach houses and motel rooms and stay as close as possible to the rental units for access to all the comforts.
- At this time there is no danger to beach erosion, wildlife habitats or nesting areas that this would address. There is no need to close beaches to ORV traffic year-round.
- By expanding that it would deny ORV access to the largest part of what access is left on the ramps adjacent to the villages.
- Would make many areas that are now open closed.
- this may be effective, but I would argue that there is currently more area open to pedestrian only use than to ORV use. Why skew it even further?

- Once again, I'm worried about this since the shoreline is getting more developed. 1/2 to 1 mile of beach would possibly remove current ramps and definitely affect the amount of beach currently available for ORV's.
- currently there are many miles passive beaches, north of Buxton and north of ramp 55 we don't need more passive beaches
- You've never walked 300ft carrying beach gear in the sand. That's why I got an ORV. Not many people will want to walk that far. Not effective.
- both groups should be able to share the resource
- There are many areas where people can access the park and be away from crowds.
- This would cut off access to many beach ramps. A possible solution if this is need would be to move any affected ORV ramps.
- The pedestrians I have encountered have been polite and continue the walk. It seems to me nobody is in anybody's way.
- This would result in closure too many active ramps. A buffer zone of this magnitude is not necessary. There is over 75 miles of open beach to provide access to undeveloped areas. This is unacceptable and will not be fair and equitable.
- Extending the passive areas would NOT allow passage over many of the ramps in the Park, which would NOT be acceptable
- 16 miles of Pea Island is undeveloped and open to pedestrians and closures are set farther than 1/2 mile or 1 mile anyway
- No need. They can walk over anywhere now while ORVs may or may not be able to access.
- Too one sided .... today, appears the villages are protected well .. no need to expand the area of closure.
- This is a bad idea as it would incorporate several access ramps and thereby provide fewer recreational opportunities for ORV users.
- Would probably block present access points
- Each village is not a private beach.
- There are enough non-ORV beaches on the island where people can go to get away from it all. E.g. Pea Island beaches.
- It is not reasonable to expect undeveloped non-ORV areas in the middle of developed areas. Undeveloped non-ORV areas are provided in the 13 miles that make up Pea Island 13 miles provides more than adequate space for those who desired non-developed ORV areas. Furthermore, there are two other areas in close proximity that provide for this type of experience--Portsmouth Island and Cape Lookout.
- This additional distance is not needed. Village visitors already have access to these areas. A closure such as this would basically closed the beach from ramp 23 to Pea Island. Again these beaches are "NOT" private beaches for the village use only
- That would be unnecessary because summer vacationers don't go to the beach with their families and walk a mile up the beach with all their stuff. The safety argument would not be applicable to expanding the closures. The end result would be less access for the visitors to the park.

- Pedestrians can already access such areas on Pea Island
- 1.D.3, which addresses this topic in a village specific manner, may be effective.
- There are plenty of passive recreation areas available at the present time. Witness, the lighthouse area, the area north of the motels in Buxton all the way to the Canadian Hole as well as all of Pea Island. In addition currently the entire stretch from Frisco to Ramp 55 which is essentially a private beach
- These areas would be underutilized. One or two people using a mile of beach puts more pressure on other areas. This needs to be investigated on a beach by beach basis. If there is no or minimal pedestrian traffic, they could be safely used by vehicles also.
- 1.C.5 Passive Recreation is a very misleading term - see note at end. Not only do the villages cover several miles of beach front themselves but currently to the north of the tri-village area there is 13 miles of non-ORV beach, to the north of Buxton there is several miles of non-ORV beach and to the west of Frisco and to the east of Hatteras there is about three miles of non-ORV beach. Thus every village except Avon (which is 4 miles of its own beach) now has much more than a mile of non-ORV beach available to pedestrians if they would turn in one direction or the other. This idea would either close or require to be moved ramps 23, 34, 38 and 55 which is stupid
- Problem may rest with definition of "village". This concept may effectively provide some private homes with "private beach"
- By doing this access ramps are used by passive users, blocking access to beaches by ORV users who must access only at ramps. Passive users can access anywhere except into a closure for birds / turtles.
- This would effectively reduce the number of ramps and create overcrowding at the other open ramps.
- If passive recreation areas were to be extended for 1/2 to 1 mile on either side of each village, at least 6 ramps would be closed.
- The beaches in front of the villages are "undeveloped non-ORV areas" already. The houses behind the dunes do not detract from the pedestrian experience on the beach. Pedestrians also have access to Pea Island and to the old lighthouse site, which are "undeveloped non-ORV areas", and which do not have developed areas behind the dunes.
- A passive area on each side of the village may be a good idea, but 1/2 mile is too much. One quarter mile would be plenty as a compromise. However, care would be required that this 1/4 mile extension did not "close off" an existing ramp. I think the status quo here, the way it is now, is much more acceptable.

**1.C.6** Open all beaches in front of all villages to ORVs outside of the seasonal ORV closure dates.

**Definitely Effective**

- It would take vehicle pressure off of the existing ORV areas and since most people visiting in the off season are not there to swim or sunbathe, the impact on pedestrians should be minimal
- this could reduce conflicts in seasons when rental visitation is low.
- All beaches should be open to ORV traffic in the "off" season September – June
- The key in this idea is the word ALL. That would add Frisco & Hatteras
- Allowing ORV access to village beaches is the status quo. As per the attached (LUIZER) "Additional Comments\_off season use" there is no justification for closing the village beaches outside of the seasonal closure dates.

- Only issue I have is the definition of “seasonal”. It appears the season is getting longer on both ends

### **May Be Effective**

- This may lessen impact to other ramps and beaches being heavily used and maintained due to them being the only ones that are opened.
- This would work better in a village-specific context.
- Should be done on case by case basis involving local communities.
- Except as needed for temporary safety and resource closures.
- Possibly cause some congestion
- Would recommend local village input and strongly recommend consideration of reasons of beach use. Is village in area of predominately fishing use during off season?

### **Not Effective**

- Safety to pedestrian traffic has higher priority
- Does not appear to take into account species habitat and seasonal range requirements
- Too rigid. Does not allow for resource changes over time
- Need to be ped only
- I think certain areas should be ORV free like Pea Island for passive users (including fishermen) to enjoy at any time of year.
- This is dangerous to pedestrians and vehicles.
- Work with county and landowners in villages to establish public access to NP beaches via county land.

### **1.C.7 Establish/increase parking on the edge of each village.**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- This should be done regardless of any other outcome.
- This is sorely needed. There are currently fewer parking spaces along the beach now than there were in the 1970's.
- Good idea for people who do not have ORV's or who do not feel comfortable driving on beach.
- this could reduce conflict by providing additional access to beaches that are closed to ORV use.
- Yes the number of parking spaces should be increased in a very limited manner to accommodate the summer visitor volume. The goal should be to decrease the random parking along side hwy 12 due to safety reasons. However, more large parking lots should be limited to the currently developed areas. The overarching goal is the safety of the non-ORV visitors but not's let sacrifice the green spaces for visitor parking lots in undeveloped areas. Keep it green. Any expansions should be well planned.
- Highway 12 is dangerous enough without all the vehicles parked beside the road.

- Having parking in area that aren't adjacent to ORV ramps such as in Frisco.
- Absolutely! When the beaches are closed to ORV's in the season, parking is a major issue.
- Since there is little to none, some more seasonal legal parking would add beach for non ORV folks
- Parking at ORV ramps needs to be increased. Parking on or near the ramps should be prohibited.
- If needed – cannot say I have seen parking lots packed. More importantly is to have handicap walkways – for ex. South Beach community south of Salvo –NPS let them build a walkway that is not Handicap accessible. NPS ans. it is not needed – how about the law for accessibility.
- Parking spots have been reduced since 1978 and visitors have increased many times and thus this concept is long overdue. Due to many private streets in the villages the current set up for public village walkovers is not adequate. A good example is Hatteras Landing in Hatteras across from the ferry docks. The beach in front of these houses is effectively private because there is no public parking available to access the walkover.
- Absolutely! With all the land available and the high use rates, as well as unsafe parking alongside Hwy 12, more and larger, non-impervious parking areas are needed. This is not just confined to village areas eg the walkover between Frisco and Hatteras, as well as the surfing area north of the Tri-villages

### **May Be Effective**

- Doubtful that can be done effectively without impacting private property and overwash areas.
- This could limit damage done to dunes, vegetation, and possible wildlife from dune hoppers.
- This may be effective as it would give those without ORV access to areas they would not normally have, but only if they have an adequate pedestrian crossing not impacting the dune
- Seems reasonable if resources remain protected
- This would allow pedestrians get access to more beach. When I first started surf fishing this is how I got access.
- Increase parking along the entire beach.
- Effective is it is on the highway and not on the beach and allows drivers to walk onto the beach.
- If walkways established so pedestrians don't have to walk on ramp accesses
- Establish/increase parking with proper consideration of resource protection and esthetic ideals. CHNS should not become a series of Highway 12 parking area in close succession. There should be areas of the Park that are difficult to get to and areas that have easy access.
- If this is done, I suggest the expanded areas identified in 1.C.5 be 1 mile on either side of each village.
- Parking during the summer season can be inadequate in those areas where the distance to the beach can be practically walked. In the off-season, parking lots are rarely full. Areas where surfers congregate would benefit from additional parking on Highway 12. Additional parking would not be beneficial to fishermen.

### **Not Effective**

- From a safety standpoint this is not effective. However, impacts to access areas should be mitigated by opening areas on Pea Island that would not impact wildlife.

- These parking lots encourage people to take "short cuts" over dunes and into plover breeding areas. If one can drive to the waters edge the dunes remain unmolested.
- Creating parking lots will not meet objective of minimizing impact on vegetation, will incur additional costs, and will invite temporary visitors who may not have "civic engagement"
- Concentrating pedestrians at the edge on the ORV access will increase conflicts, safety concerns
- This alternative would provide passive users who do not own or rent in the villages access to passive use areas. Insofar as the village fronts extend for considerable distances, the availability of such parking should not be used as justification for closing village beaches off-season when shelter from the elements becomes essential to visitor enjoyment and overall usage is low.
- This is not clear enough. For what purpose is the increased parking? ORV or Passive or both.
- By building code, parking for occupants must be provided for at each residence.

**(No Selection)**

- This could help ORV users as well as individuals who want to swim or sunbathe on the beach. There is very little parking available for folks staying in a cottage away from the beach.

**1.D. Village-Specific Management Approach for Beaches in Front of Villages**

**1.D.1** Establish village-specific dates for seasonal ORV closures in front of villages.

**Definitely Effective**

- With village input.
- Yes and this should be limited from 5/1 to 9/6. Summer season only
- Some areas have less pedestrian traffic than others, gives the villages a voice
- Could work. For example Ocracoke District has a different visitation pattern than other Districts. Should be revisited on say a five (5) year time frame to review new/changing patterns.

**May Be Effective**

- But, all villages cater to the tourist trade which is dictated by the school year and the weather.
- May be effective to reach harmony between groups and the main thing to consider with closures in front of villages is safety of everyone, not "who owns the beach"
- Firm fixed dates take away from the flexibility to manage.
- These areas should be open to ORV use for the fall winter and early spring seasons.
- Perhaps on a trial basis to determine effectiveness
- Seems reasonable if it is possible to predict with some certainty the factors that might lead to closures
- This may be useful, but when I enter the beach from a ramp and see stakes and signs for closer I never cross. It would be nice to know in advance and save the gas.
- Due to the density of houses in the villages this is a great option

- Could work ... depends on representation of the committee that determines/defines the specific dates.
- Effective if closure is year-round for all villages.
- Perhaps villages could petition the NPS for modification of the beach closures with the provision for public hearings on the changes.

### **Not Effective**

- Year around closures and expansion of passive recreation areas are not acceptable. Beaches belong to the public and are not private property and should be accessible by the public
- consistency will be better to reduce confusion among users
- Will add to confusion and require additional enforcement activity.
- the villages are not incorporated so they have no one to legally speak for them.
- Dates should all be the same.
- Does not promote uniformity in regulation
- Unless there are natural resource timing issues involved, if there is to be closures in front of the villages they should be the same for all.
- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for ALL types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15. This applies to all villages.
- Dates are already established ( May 15 thru sept.15) and should not be increased.
- No need. Villages are essentially uniform in development and seasonal beach use.
- Villages should be closed year round to ORV use, Dare County should provide access points and parking to NPS beach through village areas.
- This sounds interesting but it's probably unworkable. Who would establish the village specific dates? Homeowners, residents, park personnel, one rich loudmouth with a two million dollar beach front house?
- GENERALLY JUST MAKES RULES HARDER TO REMEMBER AND FOLLOW. VILLAGES AREN'T AS DYNAMIC AS THE SHORE (EXCEPT WHEN HURRICANES WASH THEM AWAY)

**1.D.2** Establish year-round ORV closures on the beach in front of some, but not all, villages.

### **May Be Effective**

- Closure depends on the unique situation.
- Get village input. They know the area best.
- Agree that the villages are different and therefore could have different requirements. The committee to determine closure dates must have fair representation of the village's interests.
- Would recommend local village input and strongly recommend consideration of reasons of beach use. Is village in area of predominately fishing use during off season?

- OK if closures affect all villages year-round.
- As long as this is determined by a majority of residents of their village and approved by their local govt.

### **Not Effective**

- Unnecessary restriction of resources.
- Because of seasonal erosion and wildlife nesting closures.
- I think consistency is more predictable.
- The limited pedestrian use of beaches during the off season does not justify year-round closures.
- Closures are necessary only on a case by case basis such as safety issues or nesting sites.
- During the Fall and Winter seasons beginning in September and running thru May, there is no reason those beaches should not be open to ORV access.
- Not a good outcome - year-round closures are just a bad idea, regardless of where they would be.
- Could lead to discrimination charges or bring politics into play
- Certain winter months become pointless to deny access
- ORV closures should only be on beaches where conditions justify closure
- Year around closures and expansion of passive recreation areas are not acceptable. Beaches belong to the public and are not private property and should be accessible by the public
- Sets a precedent that could lead to all villages beaches being closed.
- I don't see were this would help any. A better way to handle issue were access need to be stopped for some reason would be a temporary closure for a certain time frame.
- Too subjective... The beaches need to be open year round for local fishing
- Event though the beach in front of some villages may need to stay closed for an extended period of time. Landscape changes may add ½ mile of beach in front of the villages, this needs not to be set in stone.
- Closures should be seasonal and all the same.
- There is no reason for this now. In the off season by a large majority ORV fishermen make up the tourists To deny access to these beaches makes no sense. There are a very few who want these beaches closed in front of their houses. When they bought their houses, THEY DID NOT BUY PRIVATE BEACH FRONT.
- All villages should have year-round ORV closures.
- I'm in favor of maintaining the May 15<sup>th</sup> to September 15<sup>th</sup> seasonal closures. Outside those dates, treat the village beaches the same as the rest of the beaches.
- We seem to have that now as regards Frisco and Hatteras and I am not in favor. Rather I recommend opening these beaches seasonally within safety limitations.
- This is not a village decision.

**1.D.3** Expand passive recreation areas (e.g., 1/2 mile, 1 mile) on either side of some, but not all, villages.

**May Be Effective**

- Will help passive recreation by providing more area. 1 mile is too big. May require relocation of ORV ramps to provide access to ORV use areas.
- Due to terrain and the beaches being different some leeway here would be a positive thing.
- This has merit, provided ORV access to open areas is reconfigured in appropriate locations.
- This may be a safety issue and not a good idea
- Some of the villages may need to have seasonal passive areas
- During the season, May 15- Sept. 15, if there is parking this would allow the non-beachfront tourist access
- It would be interesting to try this in Avon to see how the additional passive space is used. I'm not sure whether there's any place else where it would make much difference.
- As long as this is determined by a majority of residents of their village and approved by their local govt.
- Depends on beach area availability. This would be nice for some surf shore fishing. I think it is a problem when someone is fishing on the beach during the peak of swimming activities.

**Not Effective**

- Could lead to discrimination charges or bring politics into play
- By expanding that it would deny ORV access to the largest part of what access is left on the ramps adjacent to the villages.
- Many of these things can be done now with no conflict with ORV's. Anything requiring "gear" -even picnics will not happen far from vehicle or home access.
- Needs to be the same for each
- Too much confusion
- Are the beaches in front of the villages too crowded? If these area were created additional parking should be provided
- Appears to favor one community and cottage rental area over another, and does not appear to be sensitive to resource protection requirements.
- Think areas are large enough as is—seems like quite a few ocean front renters prefer driving out somewhere else rather than use the beaches in front of their cottages(personal opinion and observation
- Delete the term “passive recreation”
- No. Keep in green.
- Passive recreation must be allowed throughout the CHNS unless it conflicts with resource protection.

- All villages should have year round passive recreation areas with a minimum of 1 mile on either side of the villages
- This will close some existing ramps causing overcrowding at the other ramps.
- This expansion would not allow passage over some of the existing ramps. This is not an acceptable solution.
- Passive area not acceptable. Not in definition of plan required for multi-use park

#### **1.D.4 Evaluate and expand parking on a village-by-village basis.**

##### **Definitely Effective**

- This should be done regardless of any other outcome.
- Important for those who lack ORV's.
- Make the beaches in front of the villages more accessible to pedestrians, they are not the private beaches of the waterfront property owners.
- may not be able to easily or safely provide parking at all sites
- Would appear to have potential for being effective, if resource sensitivity a key factor.
- Yes in a planned in limited manner only. Keep it green in the non-developed areas. Yes the number of parking spaces should be increased in a very limited manner to accommodate the summer visitor volume. The goal should be to decrease the random parking along side hwy 12 due to safety reasons. However, more large parking lots should be limited to the currently developed areas. The overarching goal is the safety of the non-ORV visitors but not's let sacrifice the green spaces for visitor parking lots in undeveloped areas. Keep it green.
- Yes additional parking would definitely help. A parking area is needed north of Rodanthe for surfers.
- It wouldn't take a very in depth study to see that certain areas along the seashore need additional parking due to the recreation activities in that locale.
- At the north end of Buxton & Rodanthe, parking lots with designated pedestrian beach access would be a big safety improvement. But in Avon, the current parking lots at the north & south ends of town are often empty even at peak season; increasing the size of these lots seems unwarranted.
- As long as this is determined by a majority of residents of their village and approved by their local govt.

##### **May Be Effective**

- As with any park there will be certain areas that dictate more facilities and others with less.
- This may be effective as it would give those without ORV access to areas they would not normally have, but only if they have an adequate pedestrian crossing not impacting the dune
- May not be needed in some
- Parking should be made available according to the number of visitors by village and available space.
- All the villages suffer the same thing, non beachfront renters have no place to park or walk over without trespassing on a beachfront lot or trampling a dune down.

- Yes, Some villages need more parking such as North of Rodanthe where the surfers congregate. Also think there should be a passive area just North of Buxton.
- Most ocean front developments in the seven villages pretend that they own the beach in front of them which is not the case. Expanded in-village parking should be evaluated and should not be considered for the edges of the villages. In order to fully utilize the seasonal closures, additional in-village parking should be considered for those visitors that are renting soundside and do not have access via ORV or via oceanfront accommodations.

### **Not Effective**

- difficult to enforce and not good for people not familiar with the area
- Building parking lots adjacent to villages is not what is needed. Build parking lots within the park at remote locations to accommodate visitors.
- All areas need more parking including middle of villages.

## **1.E. Consistent Management Approach for Beaches in Front of NPS Campgrounds and for Lifeguarded Beaches**

**1.E.1** Designate passive recreation areas in front of all campgrounds during the summer season.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Nothing new on OBX. Northern beach towns have adopted this approach and it appears to work.
- These areas have denser pedestrian activity. Appropriate ORV restrictions should apply.
- As long as there are visitors using the campground any section of NP beach adjacent to campgrounds should prohibit ORV use.

### **May Be Effective**

- Could block access to other parts of the beach.
- My meet the visitor experience objective, but the Frisco campground may pose an issue due to the distance of access between ramp 49 and 44.
- This is a safety factor.
- If ORV usage is not permitted in these areas, then not providing for a variety of appropriate visitor use. Many campers may bring their ORV to the beach to haul all their equipment; so it would be can't park in front of my own house.
- May need to make provisions for beach traffic to bypass these areas if this is done. Will this require more ramps?
- A lane for vehicles through the beach in front of a campground could improve the experience for the campers when they use the beach.
- However, limit the ORV restriction to daylight hours or while the beach is open and lifeguards are on duty. Also, only implement this in front of campgrounds that are actually open for business, not shutdown for the season (Cape Point).
- This should be the case as the percentage of young children and pets is high in campgrounds.

- effective if an ORV corridor exists
- One possibility would be to allow ORV to only "pass through" these areas in a narrow corridor back close to the dunes so that those guarded areas would not have ORV driving through where small children may be.

### **Not Effective**

- There should be an ORV pass thru.
- Would eliminate many ORV areas now used for fishing.
- Life guarded beaches should be passive rec areas. Campground beaches should not be passive rec
- Camp ground beaches need to have an ORV corridor through them and should not be designated as passive recreation areas. This designation should be used for life guarded beaches only
- Many of the campers are ORV users. You also do not have campgrounds that are within close proximity to the beaches so long walks carrying all your items makes campers look for the shortest distance to a spot. I see no problem with current ORV and campers on the beach so this is not needed.
- I stay in these campgrounds and there is beach closures to ORV all ready in place within very little walking distance.
- Not needed ... should not assume the campers use the beaches exclusively. That has not been my experience.
- would result in permanent summer closures to some of the best family beaches
- This is not effective nor fair. A lot of ORV users camp in the campground and a through-route for ORV's should not be a safety issue and will allow all users an equal opportunity to the resource
- NPS campground beaches are not private beaches
- At Cape Point that is a long walk, and there are no facilities (porta-potties) close to the beach. Oregon Inlet would cut off a large part of the ORV beach that is not affected by the narrowing and resource closures on the inlet side of ramp 4. A pass through would need to be used here.
- Access in front of the campgrounds should be left as ORV access areas. The reason is that, with the possible exception of Ocracoke campground, making the trek in the summer heat from the campground with kids, beach paraphernalia, water, etc. is not conducive to passive use. As a result passive use of these beaches is extremely limited. A considerable number of families do, however, utilize these beaches with the aide of ORVs for the purpose of engaging in activities such as picnicing, swimming, boogie boarding, quates, volley ball, etc. For example, the area in front of Frisco Campground (ramp 45 to ramp 49) accounted for 504 out of the 2,938 vehicles counted on May 26. Redesignating Frisco Campground as a passive recreational area would result in these 504 family units moving into areas used primarily for fishing, surfing, etc. or into areas where the beach is not nearly as attractive for swimming because of steep drops and stiff currents while leaving the beaches in front of the campgrounds underutilized.
- That means you can't go from the Fresco airport to the point, not good.
- This would limit access to the point south beach. ORV pass through needs to be maintained for use of all visitors not only campers
- Most visitors that use the campgrounds also access the beach via ORV at designated ORV access areas, including in front of the campground, for example, at Cape Point. Declaring a passive recreation area in front of the campground would cause access denial to the user group

- I don't see the correlation between a campground and limited ORV access in that area. If anything, there should be more access so that people enjoying the campground also have the ability to enjoy ORV access in that area.
- ORV pass through in front of campgrounds allows beach use by all visitors.
- I did not know there were any beach front camping areas left? If there are beach front areas, yes. For camping areas far from the beach, such as by the lighthouse in Buxton, no.
- Cape Point Camp Ground would be an example of area where closed beach would never be accepted. Oregon Inlet and Ocracoke Campgrounds may also cause undue hardships on ORV users.
- ORVs & pedestrians have co-existed for 50 years. No need to restrict ORV use. Those who choose to stay in these campgrounds are well aware of the ORV use. When NPS accepts reservations for their campgrounds they have a duty to let the prospective campers know about ORV use. Is there any study or survey to show the campers are unhappy with ORV use? Life guarded beaches should be considered passive recreation areas, campground beaches should not.
- Studies of actual beach usage by campground pedestrians needs to be conducted so that safety issues can be addressed for these areas without limiting ORV access by a full closure.
- Campgrounds are significantly far from the beach that the number of bathers is far less then the villages, some will use ORV, and closing the beach to ORV use will severely enforce major detours to ORV drivers
- Such action would close Ramps 45 (currently closed) and 49. It would also close the beach from the "hook" at the Point to the South beach. Additionally, resource closures need to be taken into consideration.
- Campgrounds should not be passive areas. The beach in front of campgrounds should be open to ORVs. If a compromise is needed here, on a case by case basis, an ORV corridor should be developed whereby the ORVs can safely "passthrough" the area immediately in front of the campground and this corridor area would be closed to ORV parking, just to be used as passthrough. But, in most cases on the two islands, this corridor would not be necessary and ORV's should be allowed open access in front of campgrounds.

**1.E.2** Designate passive recreation areas in front of lifeguarded beaches during the summer season.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- This must be mandatory for visitor safety.
- Seems necessary in the interest of public safety.
- This has to include signage on Rt. 12 and in all the rental books. If this happens parking will have to be increased.
- Direct correlation between people swimming in these areas and ORV access, limiting the driving on the beach would be a good thing and reduce accidents.
- Should include an expanded area past the lifeguarded beach area. Not everyone near the lifeguard stand is swimming, but because of the facilities (parking bathrooms) they make for the best occasional beach user access.
- Allow a pass through like at ramp 43 so ORV can go north to fish or picnic with family
- If lifeguards are there and public parking is nearby. Ramp 43 used to be an area, but it hasn't had parking or paid lifeguards in more than ten years.

- Without question, lifeguarded beaches should be “off limits” to ORV. A lifeguarded area will concentrate bathers and the guards will be sufficiently occupied without need for looking out for vehicles. Recommend in some instances a good interdunal road bypass to avoid these areas

#### **May Be Effective**

- These are limited areas with high foot traffic in the summer
- Possibly for the visitor experience objective again.
- Could block access to other parts of the beach.
- Not on Hatteras that's its charm.
- May need to provide ORV corridor behind lifeguarded area.
- Limit the ORV restriction to daylight hours or while the beach is open and lifeguards are on duty.

#### **Not Effective**

- Still need an ORV pass thru.
- Maybe only in front of the villages
- This is required to provide users with an opportunity for a controlled environment. However, under no circumstances should the number and location of lifeguarded beaches be expanded from the status quo.

**1.E.3** Designate an ORV pass through corridor (no parking) in front of campgrounds on the upper beach, and designate the lower beach as a passive recreation area (e.g., pedestrians, sunbathers, beachcombers, anglers, surfers, etc.).

#### **Definitely Effective**

- This by far would be the way to meet the objectives.
- ORV pass thru is a viable option at campground beaches only and would allow use by all visitors and campers alike.
- Definitely effective as this will reduce the ORV footprint on access ramps and interdunal roads to move around these areas.
- Needed at ramp 49 Frisco campground

#### **May Be Effective**

- This could work, the ORV users simply want a passage thru to a usable area where they also perform the same activities as the "passive" users, personally I see no difference. If you use an ORV to get to an area you are going there to fish, sunbath, surf etc.
- If very close to access points
- This is a better option than preventing access to areas beyond the campgrounds with a full closure
- There will always be morons that need to be cited under this plan but this would be helpful to have access on the back beach area
- This is a possible win-win providing usage and safety

- Safety will need to be addressed carefully
- Summer season only, full ORV use in other seasons.
- these beaches can be narrow and crowded.
- Why, If the beach is busy I just move on.
- May work if monitored.
- This might be a good solution. Which side of the point would be considered? With the parking area and close access to the beach at the end of the point road and access at the old light house parking lot I feel this campground should be exempt. It is a very long walk to the beach in either direction and most will drive to the parking area anyway
- If a designated beach is put in effect at Cape Point this will have to be done, the same at Oregon Inlet. At Cape Point facilities will need to be put closer to this beach. Plus in-season a life guard should be on duty.
- Pass through corridors are a good idea. This would provide access to both sides of the protected areas, provide the length of the protected area does not exceed the length of the camp grounds
- again lots of families/children that can be hurt by ORV use here
- As written I do not agree with this alternative for beaches in front of campgrounds. I suggest there is enough area to allow 30 feet of "hood to tailgate" ORV parking on the upper beach with a buffer 15 feet from the toe of the dune, then an ORV pass through or track. In cases where it is determined there is not enough area to use this system, an area of ORV parking should be established on either side of the pass through section of beach. Campground regulations should be separate from lifeguard beach regulations.

#### **Not Effective**

- Unworkable.
- Because of erosion.
- Would put vehicles and pedestrians in same area - let them have the summer months in front of campgrounds. If there were enough ramps, the ORV's could use them to circumvent the campground
- Dividing the beach this way is unrealistic. It ignores the bad behavior of some ORV drivers and some passive beach users, who will always ignore the designations (this is as much a safety issue as anything). It also holds out the promise of more posts and ropes on the beach, which is a personnel intensive activity and is unpleasing to the eyes of both ORV drivers and passive beach users. Scrap this one in a hurry.
- Unless I'm mistaken, this is a huge chunk of the beach that you want to completely take away from ORV's. With limited parking, these areas would see very little use.
- Sharing the beach is not a problem now and it will not be in the future.
- Don't try to regulate recreation activities
- Based upon the facts that the Oregon Inlet and Cape Point campgrounds are not located within easy access to the beach, this alternative is not applicable to the Oregon Inlet and Cape Point campgrounds. Ocracoke campground is already closed to ORV access as a life guarded beach thus this alternative is not applicable to Ocracoke campground. Access to the beach from Frisco campground is viable but not often used because of the length of the walk in the summer heat with beach paraphernalia. That said, it is possible that a short section (no more than a football field in length) in front of the boardwalk could benefit from this concept but the emphasis of this beach should be left as is, family access via ORV. This beach is quite heavily used (504 out of the 2,938 vehicles

counted on May 26) by families with small children and ORVs. The reason is quite simple, this is the one stretch of beach within CHNSRA that is consistently flat, easy to drive on, and very conducive to swimming because of the lack of drop offs and currents.

- This will not be safe. The passives have to cross the ORV path. Kid runs out from behind dune, ORV speeding, child hit by ORV.
- Not sure what this covers, but it seems to take away area where ORVs could fish before
- ORV pass through on the upper beaches destroys natural resources in that area.
- beaches in front of campgrounds are too far away for a camper to walk to.
- ORV trails should not go through passive recreational areas, the areas are all too narrow to be safe, visitor esthetics, and views and soundscapes would be compromised.
- Very dangerous to have pedestrians crossing over ORV traffic lanes to access the water.
- This is not needed! For example, campers from the NPS Frisco campground routinely hitch rides with the ORV users! Secondly many campers use their ORV's to transport surfboards, fishing equipment, umbrellas, coolers etc. and recreate right in front of the campground while in close proximity to those in their party who may choose to stay at or return to the campground. It seems to be more dangerous to have the ORV's traveling near the dunes, where the campers enter the beach, than to have ORV's lower on the beach where they are quite visible!
- This has some safety problems as visitors walk between the campground and the lower beach. More importantly though is the visitor experience. Visitors using these beaches should not be subjected to the sight, noise, smell, ruts, etc. of ORVs. The ORV can drive around as there are paved roads along nearly all of the Seashore.

## **1.F. Case-by-Case Management Approach for Beaches in Front of NPS Campgrounds and Lifeguarded Beaches**

**1.F.1** Continue status quo for lifeguarded beaches i.e., Coquina Beach closed to ORVs during summer season from Nags Head Village line to south of Ramp 2, and closed to ORV during winter season as a safety closure from Nags Head Village line to Ramp 2 (open south of Ramp 2 in winter); Buxton lifeguarded beach closed to ORVs in the summer and Hatteras Island lighthouse area closed to ORVs in the winter; Ocracoke lifeguarded beach closed to ORVs within the campground during the summer, and open to ORV use in the winter use when the campground is not open to visitors. (*status quo*)

### **Definitely Effective**

- Current plan is acceptable.
- I've not heard that this isn't working. so prefer to leave things as is
- Ramp 1 should be reopened to allow access, ramp 2 should be kept as a seasonal closure.
- This approach is appropriate. Although the closed areas have light pedestrian traffic during winter months, they provide an outlet for users who desire access to beach areas completely devoid of mechanical vehicles. The areas which are seasonally closed have extremely light pedestrian traffic during the winter and should remain open to ORV use in the winter.

### **May Be Effective**

- This has been effective so far and creates some predictability, but I do believe that "bypass" lanes only in front of most of the beaches is a way to go. Again safety should be main objective here.

- A lane for vehicles through the beach in front of a campground could improve the experience for the campers when they use the beach.
- Closing access to ORV use during high visitor summer seasons makes sense but keeping it closed during cold winter months does not make sense. During times of low to no conflict the beaches should be open to ORV use.
- opening ramp 2 during the summer season and opening Coquina Beach from Ramp 2 north to Nags Head Village line should be considered.
- Too restrictive. Why can't they be open during the "off season"
- The designation of passive use area will warrant closures during the summer months. Safety closures in Nags head I do not agree with responsible use is required.
- I feel the Ocracoke rule should apply to the other campgrounds as well. Make these passive areas only.
- the beaches from ramp 43 to the jetties need to be opened to ORV traffic after the campground closes
- I don't know anyone that ever seen a lifeguard south of Oregon Inlet so it's a moot point on Hatteras Island.
- T/E species breeding may require guarded beach area to be moved at least 200 yds up or down the beach: new life guard hires must be educated to be able to explain T/E species justification (and agree with the Endangered Species Act) to the public.
- All ramps should be open in the off-season
- There must be a valid reason for all areas closed to ORV use. Criteria for Resource, Seasonal (heavy walk on use) and Safety closures should be developed and clearly laid out in the plan. all areas mentioned in this alternative would then be subject to consideration of such criteria and decisions be based on that examination.

### **Not Effective**

- Closing beaches to ORV use outside of swimming season is an unnecessary restriction of resources.
- Ramp 1 should be open all year and ramp 2 should be closed only when the life guard beach is open. All life guarded beaches should be opened to ORV's during the off seasons when life guards are not present.
- Open beach South of Nags Head Sept. 1 to May 30 except as needed for occasional temporary safety & resource closures.
- Status quo should be challenged regarding ramp 2 should remain open in the off season when there are no lifeguards . Should also consider opening ramp 1 to ramp 2 during the off season. All others status quo.
- All mentioned beaches should be opened to ORVs during the off-season months
- I have never seen ramp 1 or 2 open, not even in the off-season. They should be open in the off-season. On Ocracoke you have done it right. Beach closed to ORV when the beach is lifeguarded, open the rest of the year. This should be done on Hatteras Island & Bodie Island.
- ALL lifeguarded beaches should remain closed during the summer but SHOULD be reopened along with all other seasonally closed beaches. Failure to reopen these beaches to ORV use needlessly restricts access when shelter from the elements becomes essential to visitor enjoyment and overall usage is low.
- This option discourages widespread use of the CHNS for passive recreation, as well as continues deterioration of natural resources.

- No justification for the Nags Head Line (Ramp 1) to Ramp 2 and Lighthouse areas to be closed in winter
- Lifeguard beaches should be established in year round passive ORV areas.
- Ramp 2 should only be closed when lifeguards are present. All life guarded beaches should be opened to ORV use during the off season and when lifeguards are not present. The status quo is not acceptable
- NO NEED TO CLOSE BEACHES WHEN PASSIVE USE IS NON-EXISTENT.
- The beach need not be closed from South Nags Head to Coquina due to the presence of lifeguards in the summer at Coquina but this stretch of beach should be open to ORV use if safe for driving year around. The Buxton lifeguard beach should be limited to a 3/10<sup>th</sup> of a mile section year around and the remaining full mile south to Ramp 43 should be open year around to ORV Multi-use as this section is rarely used in the summer and even less in the rest of the year. Congestion at the point could be reduced by opening this one mile north of Ramp 43 to ORV mulri use all year. Current use at Ocracoke is fine as stated.
- The Buxton area doesn't have parking access from the lighthouse to ramp 43. From jetties south to the lighthouse parking area is approximately 500 yards and should be closed. The rest should remain open to ORVs.
- Life guarded beaches should be open to ORV access during off season when life guards are not on duty
- Unless it is for safety, why are the beaches mentioned closed for the winter? How can you know that a beach will always be unsafe for ORV use in the winter? Seems to me that safety closures would be decided on a case by case basis as the environment changes. Ramp 1 should be open on year round basis unless safety or resource reasons require temporary closure. I like the status quo for ORV use in front of lifeguarded/campground beaches for summer only. Life guarded beaches should be open to ORV during the off season when life guards are no longer present. So, Ramp 2 should be closed only when the life guarded beach is open.

**1.F.2** Continue "status quo" for campgrounds (i.e., beach in front of Oregon Inlet Campground, Cape Point Campground, Frisco Campground open to ORV use year round; beach in front of Ocracoke Campground closed to ORV use during the summer season and open to ORV use during the winter season when the campground is closed to visitors). (*status quo*)

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Allowing a pass thru area is all that is required dual use by ORV and passive users has been the norm for many years and like any other beaches on the east coast campgrounds will be replaced by condos.
- the beach in front of Frisco Campground is one of the best beaches on the banks for fishing and surfing and family fun
- Oregon Inlet and Cape Point campgrounds are not located within easy access to the beach, thus ORV access is appropriate.at the Oregon Inlet and Cape Point campgrounds. Ocracoke campround is closed to ORV access during the summer as a life guarded beach thus restricting ORV access during the summer is appropriate at the Ocracoke campground. Once the campground is closed there is no reason to keep this beach closed. Access to the beach from Frisco campground is viable but not often used because of the length of the walk in the summer heat with beach paraphanlia. That said, it is possible that a short section (no more than a football field in length) in front of the boardwalk could benefit from the concept of a ORV pass through but the emphasis of this beach should be left as is, family access via ORV. This beach is quite heavily used (504 out of the 2,938 vehichles counted on May 26) by families with small children and ORVs. The reason is quite simple, this is the one stretch of beach within CHNSRA that is consistently flat, easy to drive on, and very conducive to swimming because of the lack of drop offs and currents. (Comment repeated for 1.F.3)
- I would support an ORV pass-through corridor in front of the Frisco campground (with no parking allowed).

#### **May Be Effective**

- Has worked in the past, however I think Ocracoke should be considered as spot to have a "pass" through land.
- May be effective as I am not familiar with all the campgrounds. Being able to manage what makes the most sense is what we need. Each campground is different and the management team needs the flexibility for each. I do like the current situation.
- Allow pass-through along upper beach in front of campgrounds in Summer season and full unrestricted access the remainder of the year. All campgrounds treated equally.
- A ORV corridor to allow access past the campground should be added.
- All lifeguarded beaches should be opened to ORV's during the off-seasons when lifeguards are not present.

### **Not Effective**

- Need to make use of ORV "pass though" option.
- Campgrounds often have children present. This status quo practice may not be working now. If not, it needs to be reexamined.
- Ramp 1 should be open in the off season. Ramp 2 and the other areas should be closed only when the life guarded beach is open. All of the life guarded beaches should be open to ORV during the off summer season. The status quo is not acceptable.
- Is there any way to find out how many "missed camping" opportunities are lost with the early closing of the Cape Point & Oregon Inlet campgrounds?
- This option discourages widespread use of the CHNS for passive recreation, as well as continues deterioration of natural resources.
- It is dangerous and discourteous to have ORV trails in front of campgrounds that visitors are actively using. Redesign entry points for ORV access that eliminate recreational conflicts with passive users and establish year round passive areas and ORV access ramps so that they will complement each other.

**1.F.3** Redefine which areas in front of NPS campgrounds and which lifeguarded beaches are open or closed to ORV use during the camping and lifeguard season on a case-by-case basis.

### **Definitely Effective**

- areas should be open to ORV use when areas are closed or lifeguards are not present.
- Intuitively this makes sense. Arbitrary definitions are not likely to work, even if they are on a case-by-case basis

### **May Be Effective**

- Prefer the ORV pass thru option if feasible
- Due to the nature of each location being the beach size or popularity of pedestrian use this could be a way to meet many objectives.
- This doesn't differ much from 1.F.2., but offers more flexibility by location. Certainly better than one size fits all.
- Consistency of the rules would be more beneficial to the user and the public and make enforcement simpler.
- This would probably lead to some confusion and enforcement ability.

- Each campground has it's own issues. i.e. Oregon Inlet is small campground and the rec area at Coquina is a much better option for beach goers.
- Since most are closed during the winter, open the beaches to ORV use then. 'Pass through' access at a minimum during the summer
- This may have merit depending on who does the redefining. Again, lifeguarded beaches should restrict ORV travel when the life guards are present and allow ORV passage at all other times. Campgrounds should always allow ORV passage. I agree that passage does not necessarily include the right to park in the middle of an area adjacent to a campground. But passage is absolutely required.
- Could work if it was done for safety or wildlife protection.
- Effective if the access to ORV use is substantially limited.
- If a guarded beach is consistently being used by more than a few people, it should be closed to ORVs. If a campground beach is being used by a significant number of pedestrians, maybe it should be treated like a village beach.
- Ramp 1 should be open all year. Ramp 2 should be closed only when the lifeguarded beach is open. All life guarded beaches should be open to ORVs during the off season when lifeguards aren't present.

#### **Not Effective**

- The situation is adequate as it stands now. It is not necessary to redefine what is working.
- The current closures for the areas above give ample use of non ORV users during the summer months .
- All life guarded beaches should be opened to ORV's during the off seasons when life guards are not present and closed when they are present.
- Will add to confusion and require additional enforcement activity.
- Families plan a year in advance for vacation.
- Keep the NPS Campgrounds and lifeguarded beaches open to ORV's in the winter and not open during the summer busy months.
- The beaches are constantly changing due to weather and tides. You would need constant monitoring of beach conditions to keep up with it. The park service won't spend the money it would cost on this type of monitoring because they use their whole budget for the piping plover. That's why no one has ever seen a lifeguard south of Oregon Inlet. Be serious. Look at the books.
- To be safe, consistent and fair all lifeguard beaches and campground visitors should be in passive areas only respective to the campgrounds and lifeguard areas.
- JUST TRY TO KEEP IT SIMPLE, WITH ORV NEEDS TAKING PRECEDENCE WHEN PASSIVE NEEDS ARE NOT A FACTOR.

#### **1.G. "Cell System" of ORV Routes to Facilitate Access Around Closed Areas**

**1.G.1** Add more ORV access ramps (no more than 2 miles apart) where NC-12 parallels the beach to facilitate access around full beach ORV closures.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Would open more areas for ORV fishermen.
- All improvements would be welcomed, many ramps become flooded due to rain or over wash. More trash containers would be welcome at ramps.
- more access ramps would stop long drives on the beach and thru crowded areas
- would reduce conflicts in open areas
- More ramps will decrease parallel beach traffic.
- This is a very good idea, would allow closures for the birds, and access for beach goers.
- As it now stands now ORVs are crowded onto a very limited area of beach. Each year this increases, while beach closures also increases in size & length.
- All Ramps and interdunal roads should be two lanes for safety reasons. Ramp 1 should be re-opened year around. An interdunal road should be established from Ramp 2 to Ramp 4. An interdunal road should be established from Ramp 4 to Oregon Inlet. Ramp 20 at the Rodanthe Pier should be re-opened seasonally. The interdunal road system between Ramps 23 and Ramp 34 should be re-opened with intermittent crossover roads to the beach. ORV access south of Ramp 38 should go further south past Haulover beach in the off season and replace the Ramp north of Buxton. The beach north of Ramp 43 should be re-opened for a full mile all year as it is not used by pedestrians and would reduce the concentration of visitors at Cape Point. Re-open the ramp at the lighthouse old site in the off season. Ramp 45 should be re-opened when the campground is closed. The interdunal road from Ramp 44 to east of Ramp 49 should be re-opened with several crossover access point roads to the beach. The ramp at the Frisco Pier should be re-opened in the off season and the beach re-opened to Ramp 55 in the off season. Pole Road must be two lanes wide again for safe passage and Spur road widened to two lanes. The beach from Ramp 59 west to Ramp 67 (which should be relocated to the east side of the parking lot) should be open year around to reduce the concentration at the inlet. The year around corridor system has only contributed to destroying bird habitat by allowing vegetation to proliferate. Year around closures and habitat maintenance do not go hand in hand. Hardcopy workbooks have incorrectly labeled maps and even corrected maps on web are misleading and still wrong. (comment repeated for 1.G.2).
- Adding access via interdunal road at ramp 4 to reach bridge area should be put into play. Years ago, there was a road that exited rt. 12 to the west just before the Bonner ridge, then went under the Bonner Bridge to access pond area. Today, this route is blocked by water, but a bypass road should be opened south of ramp 4 to pass behind dunes and ensure access on all tides, and at most times, year around.
- This would be beneficial and would be in keeping with the intent of Congress in Title 16 of the U.S. Code, Chapter 1, Subchapter LXIII, Section 459 stating that the park was established for the benefit of the people.

### **May Be Effective**

- You can meet several objectives here, and although it's more ramps, it may cut down on more heavily utilized areas and spreading the maintenance around rather than having several over used ramps.
- More ramps are not necessary if the closure areas are kept at a minimum necessary for passive recreation and other closures.
- If needed to get access to beach
- Excellent strategy but I do not feel that ramps need to be every two miles. We do need more ramps to accommodate closures.
- Having an extra ramp or two between ramp 44 and 49 would help when the Point is closed.
- Every 2 miles may be excessive, should be as needed.

- could be effective if closed area is large or if there are multiple smaller closures
- I would not like to see any additional damage done to the dunes.
- Questionable alternative which may adversely impact on resources.
- Not to be used to increase areas of full closure but to increase access in times when temporary closures for safety or resource protection are required.
- May not be necessary to mandate 2 miles apart or less.
- Additional ramps between ramps 34 and 30 as well as between ramps 27 and 23 (mostly for safety reasons i.e. narrow beaches at high tides)
- This would also provide additional walk over access for pedestrians and keep some of the dunes in better shape.
- Given the increases in full beach closures that have resulted from Superintendents Order No. 7 and the Interim Plan, more ORV access ramps could be useful. That said, it is not realistic or even desirable to expect to place ramps every 2 miles. Ramp location should be based upon usage data and the potential impact on the system of dunes that protects the highway. For example, ramps 38 and 43 are heavily used, thus a ramp between these two could be useful. In terms of resource implications, there is one area already developed, the one way road. As a second example, the undeveloped stretch of beach between Frisco Pier and ramp 55 remains closed year round. There exists a developed area between Frisco and Hatteras village (the Frisco Bathhouse). A ramp could be located at this parking area without any additional impact on the resource.
- More ORV access points would be useful if more parking was added also, but then the cost to build and for upkeep needs to be considered.
- Could be useful if the amount of closures is limited so that ramps are not necessary every two miles.
- Generally, full beach closures where NC-12 parallels the beach are due to turtle nests. Occasionally, the closures are due to colonial bird nesting areas. Almost never are they due to plover nesting areas. Careful management by the NPS ( e.g. ORV routes between the dunes and the nest, or ORV routes below high tide line) should limit full beach closures to just those dates around expected hatch. These types of closures are generally short in duration and therefore acceptable. If NPS is not able to manage ORV routes to allow passage between ramps, then more ramps would be more effective.

#### **Not Effective**

- Current ramps are sufficient
- While accomplishes access without going through the dunes, it creates a permanent parking area and a dune "cut" which is not consistent with protecting vegetation. Temporary passage through dunes is more effective.
- The costs will be much higher if this occurs and thus will be subject to cutbacks and shut downs. Keep it simple
- This is totally counter to the objectives of the management plan, probably unlawful and invites lawsuits.
- To properly manage ORV use there should be less ramps not more. Alternate ramps may be opened when needed if other ramps are closed (because of resource closures) to provide ORV access to open areas. ORV ramps create rutted, unsafe, unsightly areas of beach. The entire ramp system should be rethought and redesigned,
- Access trails cut breeding and germination habitats. T/E use back dune areas (I.E probable Wilson's Plover nest in 05.

- Overwash issues – regarding ramp 27

**1.G.2** Provide strategically located interdunal roads or bypasses (e.g., at spits and Cape Point-South Beach area) where NC-12 is not parallel to the beach. Designate a sufficient number of “cross over” routes to connect the interdunal route to the beach and facilitate access around full beach ORV closures.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Because of the established management plan and negotiated rule making at CACO it has become impossible to use previously established access points. This is an area where caution should be exercised, but is an excellent idea
- This will also decrease beach traffic
- Better maintained access at Cape Point ramp 45 to South beach area. Full beach ORV closures need to be flexible to facilitate ORV access around closures.
- Obviously, the more areas and ways that ORV users have to get around bird closures, the more effective this will be in providing safety to the birds while allowing access. Compromise is the key word.
- Wow, can we afford to do that? Would non-ORV beach users be allowed to park on or along this interdunal road?
- This is a great idea because of the long distance between ramps 44 and 49. It makes for a long ride back around when you run into a closure. And have to back track around the pond to get to the other side. Also less wear on the beach.
- 

### **May Be Effective**

- This has merit for Hatteras, but I see no value to it for Ocracoke's ramps and beaches.
- Would open more areas for ORV fishermen.
- Having an extra ramp or two between ramp 44 and 49 would help when the Point is closed.
- would depend on the extent of resource loss associated with development of these roads
- May be effective but I can foresee the S.E.L.C fighting every new change to the landscape so I feel status quo is a better option since these access points and roads already exist.
- I'm afraid that this option would require more damage to the dunes.
- Arbitrary alternative catering to 4x4s rather than resource protection.
- Not to be used to increase areas of full closure but to increase access in times when temporary closures for safety or resource protection are required.
- Given the increases in full beach closures that have resulted from Superintendents Order No. 7 and the Interim Plan, maintaining existing interdunal roads and cross overs is imperative. Additional routes can be provided by opening interdunal roads that have been closed for years. Creation of new interdunal roads and crossovers should be approached with care, so as not to create new erosion issues.
- This again will add significant costs.

### **Not Effective**

- This is totally counter to the objectives of the management plan, probably unlawful and invites lawsuits.
- Additional ORV trails should not be established in areas they were not historically in; Interdunal ORV trails dissect the Park into parcels disrupting natural ecosystems. They fundamentally diminish the spirit of the enabling legislation of this park by disrupting the physiographic processes and greatly diminish the viewscales and soundscapes of visitors.
- Too much vegetation would be impacted by this option.
- Cuts habitat when T/E at CACH need every advantage to begin an area comeback.
- This is very problematic as these areas would be seriously impacted by the addition of roads or bypasses. The reason these areas are closed is because of the heavy use by wildlife. That habitat and use needs to be protected as a core mission of the park. I would support the addition of trails so people could have pedestrian access to certain areas. If the fishing is that great, they will walk just like the did by the score when the inlet opened near Hatteras Village several years ago.
- Lets try and keep ORV's out of the dunes completely if possible.
- The status quo is working just fine here with the major exception of problems in recent past at Hatterss Inlet. Again, flexibilitiy is the key. If safety closures create problems with access, the Park should be able to provide temporary strategically located interdunal roads or bypasses.

## **1.H. Improve ORV Routes and Provision of Additional Amenities**

### **1.H.1 Improve routine maintenance of access ramps.**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Always welcome
- Yes and special attention should be paid to chronic areas like ramp 43,44,49,55,72 where drainage and over wash are common.
- the biggest improvement would be addition of trash disposal facilities and fish cleaning tables
- Particularlyly at Ramps 43, 44 anf 49. These fill often with water and need to be maintained and drained in a timely manor.
- Also, setup a volunteer program. Most people I know would love to help the NPS with this effort. Most people care and will want to ensure the plan works and things are kept in order.
- There have been many times that the few ramps we have have been closed due to standing water or disrepair. This puts more of a burden on the open ramps and results in more crowded beaches and potential for harm.
- Soft sand has to be at the start of each ramp. I know it will discriminate against the unprepared & ill equipped, but it is for their own good. A tow from farther out on the beach gets expensive.
- This can be done if the ramps are kept as they are now, But adding ramps is not prudent.
- But short rides at low speeds with the present availability of air is not a problem. High speed generating excessive sidewall temps at low air is a problem, so education is more cost effective.
- Existing or new ramps should be redesigned. Wider ramps (2 vehicles with entry and exit lanes) that are maintained with mulch or gravel on a regular basis that facilitate efficient access to the beach and avoid congestion should be considered. Vehicles should not stop or park within 200 yard of a ramp, no airing down on

approaches to ramps. Ramps should not be constructed or procedures initiated that cause access to be impeded at ramps.

- Need to look at types of materials that are sustainable yet will offer better traction. This may have to be explored by test sites.
- As of now local clubs usually provide money for maintenance. Always good idea for maintenance. While on this topic – never seen park service help clean up beach from debris – it is the fishermen and the clubs to which they belong that does most of the work in helping keep the beaches clean of debris.
- 1.H.1 All should be two lanes for safety and routine maintenance would stop the formation of potholes that grow into pools that people drive around into vegetation. Pole Road must return to two lanes and maintained regularly. This should have been standard operating procedure
- Stainless steel mesh matting is a good alternative as it will last forever with no maintenance.
- Ramps 43,44,72 have rain damage problems. These areas need to be redesigned!

### **May Be Effective**

- Additional maintenance as necessary.
- With more access points, pressure on each one will be lessened. This will allow natural rejuvenation (rain, high tides...) to naturally maintain these points.
- A simple pass-through with a tractor and scraper blade occasionally should be adequate maintenance. If drainage or other problems arise, they should be addressed on an as-needed basis.
- Even if inexperienced operators get passed a difficult ramp, won't they get bogged down on the beach at some point? The ramps should be adequately maintained but they are sand and should not be "improved" or "redesigned" for the convenience of ORV operators.

### **Not Effective**

- Current maintenance by NPS is adequate. OBPA and NCBBA volunteers help as needed
- What can be done to improve sand?
- This encourages casual and careless ORV use of CHNS beaches. (comment repeated for 1.H.2-1.H.4)

**1.H.2** Improve or redesign "difficult" ramps where inexperienced ORV operators often get bogged down (e.g., Ramp 4 and Ramp 49).

### **Definitely Effective**

- This would certainly be appreciated, not just by the ORV users, but even pedestrians who walk over at the ramps. Standing water is consistently an issue at 43/44/49
- Yes it is very bad at Oregon Inlet . ramp 49 causes sand jams when someone gets stuck
- More access points would allow vehicles to avoid these specific ramps. With a ramp every two miles it would be reasonable to use a different access point to avoid the 'difficult' ones.
- 4-43 and 44, 49-72 all need to be improved.
- With the caveat that these provide a practical test of ability and tend to discourage beach driving for those persons who shouldn't be out there.

## **May Be Effective**

- No matter what kind of ramp you build or maintenance is done there will always be people who will get stuck. Using signs and maps that warn people I think is as effective as you can be.
- Unfortunately, may increase numbers of ORVs impacting on resources particularly if increases numbers of “inexperienced drivers” on the beach.
- at the very least provide notification that passage may be more difficult at these locations
- If they are inexperienced maybe they shouldn't be using ramps except the very stable ones.
- Some ramps are harder then others, but if you air down properly I've never turned around. But if the time is wrong with the tide high and the beach narrow it would be nice to be able to get out of harms way without a traffic jam. Best advice be aware of your surroundings.
- Ramp 4 and 49 maintainance could be done more often.
- Education on driving and a mandatory beach driving kit should be implemented (i.e. shovel, piece of board, jack stand and such)
- Pardon me but, some people are just stupid. Perhaps signs at each ramp that map out key points to avoidance of issues on the beach ... i.e. (1) deflate all tires to at least 20PSI, (2) do not drive within 30 feet of the water line (3) do not exceed 25 MPHs, etc,etc....
- This may be effective. I also believe putting up caution signs stating the dangers and problems for inexperienced drivers would yield a benefit.
- The designs now are OK. Drivers just need to know to let down air pressure. Larger signs may help.
- Just put up a few more information signs and if the dummies want to try to go out the ramp in two wheel drive, let them fend for themselves. The government doesn't have to protect them from themselves.

## **Not Effective**

- Inexperienced drivers will always have some problems.
- If you don't know how to drive on a beach then stay off it its a very simple process
- educate "inexperienced" operators to LET SOME AIR OUT OF THEIR TIRES.
- If they can't drive in soft sand they should stay away.
- People will always get stuck
- This is causing a lasting effect on the resource that is not consistent with the natural conditions.
- Additional warnings may be needed to explain the difference in the sand.
- Ramp 4 does not need to be redesigned.
- always going to have those hard headed drivers who don't pay attention to signs suggesting to air down at most of the ramps now

- The inexperienced & unprepared need to be stopped at the beginning of the ramp. If you lessened the soft sand at #4 or 43-44, 49, & 55, all that would be accomplished is the stuck tourist will be closer to the water & closer to a high tide.
- It is better to redesign ramps, if interdunal roads are used (only ones already established) they should be wide enough so two cars can safely pass at slow speed. The Park has to commit to maintaining the interdunal roads. Interdunal roads should be closed when standing water causes ORV user to leave the designated trail. ORV users historically have blazed areas out of the boundaries of the ORV trail if there is standing water on an interdunal ORV trail/road.
- T/E habitat shouldn't be sacrificed to train and increase stressors; ramp problems are in education of drivers before they enter the beach.

**1.H.3** Provide more pull-outs on long, narrow ramps and interdunal roads to facilitate vehicles passing.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Particularly at ramp 45 route to South beach area, Hatteras Inlet routes and at typical closure areas just north of Cape Point at the dune line
- Keeps people from making their pull offs illegally
- There has to be a way around the inexperienced. Road hogs should be ticketed & fined.
- This is needed at 49 definitely
- Yes. Currently visitors create their own and destroy habitat. Having more designated pull offs would stop this problem.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Nice, but may not be worth the effort.
- If done selectively, likely to reduce off-trail driving and reduce adverse resource impacts.
- Only if it can be done without serious environmental impact
- There is need for an additional pull-out on the interdunal road off of ramp 44.
- Would be nice. I hate cheating toward the dunes.
- not a big problem in my experience
- When a new interdunal road is cut, just make it wide enough for two vehicles to pass safely and you don't need any more pull outs.
- Push courteous driving habits and not disturb more than is necessary
- This could help a little but it would be of low priority in my concept., Only once have I seen this problem and then it was worked out between the cars involved.

#### **Not Effective**

- I don't see the current situation as a big problem. use your money elsewhere.
- Further damage to protective dunes is not necessary.

- No. Protect the dunes and green space. Two-way traffic is all that is required.
- Probably would encourage drivers to increase speed unnecessarily .It's the beach not rte 95
- Again vegetation impacts.
- Keep it simple. Vehicles can wait in line if there are that many at that ramp.

**1.H.4** Provide adequate parking/staging areas at ORV access ramps to allow for airing down of vehicles before driving on the beach and to reduce congestion at ramp entrances.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- They seem to be adequate at present as long as people use them. This may be an education issue.
- Provide large signs indicating correct PSI for tires and caution notes reminding visitors to air down their tires.
- The hard part of this, is getting the “entitled” (I’m too important to pull off the road) to, in fact, pull off. A couple of tickets should clear that up though. The easiest way would be to widen the road and white stripe the pull off lane.
- They are adequate now. Would like to see ORV pumps available at the ramps like Assateague though
- Go one better, add solar powered air pumps.

#### **May Be Effective**

- don't see this as a big problem at most ramps
- For the ramps I am familiar with (23-44) there is sufficient parking/staging areas.
- While this would be helpful, it’s a waste of the environment. ORV can be lower well before reaching the ramp
- Most staging areas are large enough for this activity
- This may be a good proposal. I tend to stay away from the park during the summer and holiday weekend periods so I can't say for sure. (Just because of the number of ORV's on the beach.)
- Effective is adequate route is available to ones that are ready to proceed.
- Most ramps already have this. Maybe have signs saying please air down in parking lot not on ramp
- Parking requirements should be based upon observed usage patterns. With the possible exception of the point, I have rarely seen any congestion at ORV access ramps. Parking is not essential to ORV access but is essential for passive use. Parking for passive use requirements seems adequate in most areas.
- Airing down of vehicles should be done before ORV users get to the ramp. Ramps should be constructed so that they also have benefit to passive recreational users. Ramps should be placed on the boundaries between passive and ORV access areas.
- This may help to a certain extent however, it will not help a lot at very busy ramps such as Ramp 4.
- Airing down could be done elsewhere.

#### **Not Effective**

- Only if traffic volume warrants and in my experience none are required at this time. If additional ramps are added this would eliminate the need.
- There is already ample parking/staging areas for airing down. It only gets congested when inconsiderate drivers park in everyone's way to air down.
- Most of the ramps already have sufficient staging area.

**1.H.5** Improve signing of ramps, both on the beach and at the intersection of the ramp with the paved roadway.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Signage on the beach would be a big help - more signs on the roadways seems unnecessary, as ORV drivers should be able to read NPS maps or see the current signage.
- Facilitates use of ramps
- I have never missed the ramp, but coming off the beach at night can be tricky.
- Need identifying sign on beach to assist nighttime exiting of ORV's
- Yes, but the keep the signs at a low profile. They should blend with the scene.
- You betcha, a reflective sign on the beach side is long overdue.
- But use caution. We don't want to beach to become a strip mall of signs.
- A reflective sign on the beach side of each ramp would be great. It's dark out there on moonless nights.
- Signage and education vital to those who have never driven on the beach. Plus education of those who do not know of need to avoid turtle closures and bird closures. Too often I have seen those in knowledge educating those who have not taken to know the rules of beach driving. Educ. Needed.
- Long overdue. Please put up signs that say that leashes must be no longer than 6 feet
- Would facilitate emergency situations or at onset of weather conditions limiting visibility

#### **May Be Effective**

- On the beach signing may be a good thing. I have had problems at night finding the ramps during rain and fog.
- I know where they are but at times I have driven by and had turn around.
- Improved visibility of signage for ramp entrances is desirable. This year's change to full beach closure signage (brown corridor post with rope) was helpful. Insofar as many pedestrians assume they can walk the water's edge, signage with jeep and line should include another with pedestrian and line. However, care should be taken not to increase signage to the point where the aesthetic values of the park are compromised
- Effective if signs clearly ban ORV access.
- Improve signing is not a concern. ORV drivers should be tested on where the ramps are in their written test to get an ORV permit.
- Add positive T/E species importance messages also.

- Always room for improvement. In 2007, the Park placed signs on the beach between ramps noting location by mile marker. This was a good improvement. Signs on the highway seem adequate to me. I like seeing signs such as "beach access to next ramp is closed."

### **Not Effective**

- Current signing is effective

**1.H.6** Provide permanent restroom facilities (e.g., sweet-smelling vault toilets) and trash disposal containers at high-use access ramps.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Would help keep beaches clean.
- Don't know about the restrooms. I do use the trash disposal containers at the ramps that have them.
- Trash disposal - no brainer as far as I'm concerned. Vault toilets – put them between some of the ramps and at the high use areas.
- Also include outside showers ... running water.
- After all the wind boarders have one. The fishermen have been waiting for how long? The one at Pea Island, lighthouse ticket office, Frisco day use, ferry dock, north end of Ocracoke Island are not convenient to fishermen.
- Larger trash containers are need at all ramps.
- It is appalling that a park service that is obsessed with not “disturbing the flora and fauna” of the park would not have adequate trash disposal at access ramps.
- Yes I often drag commercial fishing nets and other debris off the beach and have to leave it by the ramp entrance unless I can find a dumpster.
- This will eliminate trash and make family visiting more enjoyable. Currently visitors use the beach as a bathroom due to none being available close by.
- While this is a great idea, I understand that these facilities would not only be an added expense but would also be a added worry during hurricane season as well as the winter months and the significant nor-easter's that form off the coast. I for one would love to see these facilities at the point, and hatteras inlet and Oregon inlet.
- Several porta-Johns that are serviced on a regular basis and a dumpster should be at ramp 4 absolutely. I have personally nagged NPS on this the last two years and was told it was an issue of funding! Where will the funding come from to install vault toilets?? All we need is 2 or 3 port-o-johns that are frequently serviced. They will meet the needs of most ORV users. Costs money for machines. Fishing center is only location in park that has the pump. Adding stone to ramps and cutting deep drains on edges helps!
- Use only proper trash containers that stay shut so as not to attract predators

### **May Be Effective**

- May meet the objectives for vegetation, wildlife, natural physical resources, and visitor experience.
- I don't think these should be priority items in the plan.
- Would provide a place for trash, but if not maintained on a daily basis it will become it own worst problem. This will cost money.

- Permanent restrooms too expensive but trash containers is excellent idea
- If reduces maintenance costs while maintaining high standard for public use
- I do not know if “sweet-smelling vault toilets” are the way to go. Cost? Maintenance? What are the alternative means of providing toilets? What is done now? Have clevis multtrum systems been explored?
- Rest rooms at high volume ramps. Permanent restrooms are not necessary. We must protect the rustic scenic views of the area.
- Flooding concerns during storms
- Trash disposal containers need to be placed (away from the ocean beach) so as not to attract or habituate predators to Park resources. Permanent bathrooms facilities (like the ones at Frisco) should be built in a place so that all users can access them.
- As long as the personel are available to oversee. Other wise could be problem (portable Pots may sometimes be more effective)
- Rest room facilities should be provided every 5 miles in the park but do not have to be located at a ramp facility. An ORV plan should not fund rest room facilities. All trash facilities should be predator proof and located at heavy use ramps only.

#### **Not Effective**

- This encourages casual and careless ORV use of CHNS beaches
- Public education to “pack it, pack it out” for trash. Not sure what to suggest on toilets.
- I'm against increasing the number of structures (of any kind) in the undeveloped portions of the park.
- Attracts predators to T/E species. Inform ORVers at their vehicle registration time that they must packout everything they bring in. This is the most natural resource sustainability action.

**1.H.7** Work with local businesses to provide air stations near major ORV ramps, or install air stations in the Seashore if unavailable locally.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- This would increase the amount of people who don't air down due to the "hassle" which in returns ruins ramps and causes stuck vehicles. Added costs my be worth the reduction in damage to ramps.
- Would increase the numbers of people airing down and thus lessen vehicular impact on the beach and increase safety when these vehicles are back on the highway.
- These sites would be a good place to post OVR driving rules
- This will improve on-road safety for all of us. Someone driving around on underinflated tires is an accident in the making.
- Again, solar powered air pumps.
- Model after the great air station at Assateague Island State Park in MD.
- NPS air stations could be the coin-operated type; some could be solar powered.

- An air station at the north end of Ocracoke (near Ocracoke-Hatteras ferry) would be useful – maybe in the restroom area.
- Maybe post directions to nearest air station at the ramp.
- There should be at least one air station for each "major" surf fishing area. This means that ramp 72 at Ocracoke south point, Cape Point, and Hatteras Inlet should have at least one air station located in a paved parking area. Each air station should have at least four air lines or compressors.

### **May Be Effective**

- I don't think these should be priority items in the plan.
- Working with local businesses would be nice but not to add air at each ramp.
- The air station at Buxton are getting old and don't work as well. I give these establishment my business because of this . I know they provide this at no charge to the public. However I have bought onboard air just in case. I can inflate all four tires in about half hour.
- Seashore should not provide air. If businesses want to put a station in, great.
- Require T/E positive interp displays at these areas.

### **Not Effective**

- There are currently sufficient number of local businesses with air stations
- Unnecessary, air readily available, minor impact on businesses.
- Not necessary with today's tire technology and compressor technology.
- 1.H.7 Local businesses already provide air stations. The primary problem with aired down vehicles is that they travel at 45 - 50 mph while the speed limit between villages is 55 mph. This being the case, lowering the speed limit between villages to 45 during peak usage would minimize the possibility of accidents resulting from faster moving traffic trying to pass ORVs
- This encourages casual and careless ORV use of CHNS beaches
- Most, if not all, tackle shops and service stations already have and maintain free air pumps for patrons to use. If the seashore provides them, the seashore will have to maintain them and they will not be willing to spend the money necessary to do so.
- Don't feel it's the local businesses place to have air...it's the responsibility of the ORV operator to find air upon leaving the beach and practice safe driving habits.
- Air stations need to be at private facilities in the villages or at concessions in the campgrounds. This will be better economically for local businesses and alleviate congestion at key access points. All valid ORV operators should have taken a test instructing them where and why airing down is important.
- Ditto. I don't want or need an air pump "sponsored by Tastee Freeze" by ramp 34.
- Currently exists at businesses. Would not provide air on beach or ramp

**1.H.8** Address drainage problems, where feasible, to minimize the size and duration of closures due to flooding.

### **Definitely Effective**

- The cost may outweigh the inconvenience of the closures.
- It is a good idea to “refloat the island” from time to time as storms dictate.
- Yes especially ramp 43,44,49,72
- Especially Ramp 43, 44, 45 and at ramp 49
- Drainage over and through access routes only causes more congestion at others.
- Cape Point CG is a disaster and an embarrassment compared with previous years - and closing of all but 3 rows to larger RVs is a disgrace
- This needs to be done to allow access during periods of rain. The inter dunal road often floods
- The pipe at the Point campground will be opened again? How cool. Correcting this issue, that was caused by Isabel, is long overdue. The ground water for the wells in Buxton are starting to get salted, the freshwater swamps have been killed. These areas have been drained/pumped since sometime in the 50's-60. Now saltwater is allowed to stay and evaporate on their own.
- Drainage problems created by man made ponds and structures not only impact access but also breeding and foraging areas. In point of fact, drawing down man made ponds is recommended by the Piping Plover Recovery Plan--see [http://www.obxconnection.com/forum/forum\\_detail\\_archive.asp?MID=199073&AID=](http://www.obxconnection.com/forum/forum_detail_archive.asp?MID=199073&AID=) Furthermore, drainage problems created by man made ponds and hard structures impact the Buxton woods (an area of environmental concern and home to the Buxton Woods White Footed Mouse that is listed on the NC species of concern) and alter the size of naturally occurring wetlands (see [http://www.obxconnection.com/forum/forum\\_detail\\_archive.asp?MID=194273](http://www.obxconnection.com/forum/forum_detail_archive.asp?MID=194273)).
- Bottom line, addressing drainage problems is a win/win situation for the park.
- Yes the poor drainage areas are also heavily infested with mosquitoes
- That goes without saying, but evidently the park service has not believed in that over the last 10 years. In fact, they've used flooding as an excuse to deny access.
- Buxton is the only example I am aware of.
- There is a drainage system at Cape Point that was not used for flooding a few years ago. Use it.
- Ramp 72 in Ocracoke is often closed due to flooding. It's so low that I'm not sure it can be easily fixed.
- Especially in the case of woods being destroyed by saltwater flooding

#### **May Be Effective**

- This meets several user objectives, but may go against some of the environmental ones. Airport ramp on Ocracoke could benefit, but it's the outer banks and let's face it, it floods a lot.
- this would be nice where feasible but considering the low level of the land related to sea level is it even possible?
- Ongoing problem at ramps, especially 44.

#### **Not Effective**

- Nature is going to do what she wants as far as flooding goes i can deal with her wrath on that one

- Appears to contradict management policies and statutory base
- Any alleviation of flooding would cause significant and permanent alteration of the natural systems and is not required. Flooded areas need not be closed, but left to the users discretion.
- This encourages casual and careless ORV use of CHNS beaches. It also is a waste of taxpayer money spent on the pleasure of a few individuals.
- areas of high water table would drain budgets and only be marginally effective
- Fresh water resources in the park should not be comprised. It is incorrect to address these as drainage problems in the Park. The problem is that users want ORV access through areas that can be seasonally wet. Ephemeral standing water is an important resource in a barrier island ecosystem and should not be consider a problem. Ramps, ORV trails, parking areas and new facilities should be redesigned, moved or constructed in areas that do not impact wetlands.
- This area is at sea level. We have to deal the hand we are dealt. If you want smooth sailing, stay on pavement, which they can't keep from flooding.
- Too much altering onf habitat needs for biodiversity and T/E breeding and germination. These flooded areas are needs for the survival of some needed barrier island species.
- How are you going to change the water levels, this would lead to an excuse to drain wetlands

## **1.I. Beach Access Alternatives to ORV Use**

**1.I.1** Expand existing parking lots on NPS land and provide boardwalks from lots to the beach.

### **Definitely Effective**

- May help keep Dune hoppers from destroying the dunes.
- stretches between the villages could benefit from improved parking and access
- Addresses balancing pedestrian vs. ORV use of Seashore
- Yes but must be limited to current parking lots, Boardwalks should be expanded to all parking lots unless there is well worn path thru the vegetation to the beach.
- Would help address safety concerns and facilitate the increased number of visitors.
- All efforts to accommodate visitors with additional beach access through ramps, parking, and boardwalks are overdue and are needed. Access by alternate means are impractical due to weather and water conditions. Shuttles would probably be a liability nightmare. (comment repeated for 1.I.2 – 1.I.5)
- This will be at the village edges right?
- Yes, OBX is for everyone young and old. Allow easy access to the beach for all.
- These also need to be handicap accessible – with ramps and not steps. I have a quadriplegic son and have addressed numerous rule violations and lack of attention by NPS. Need more access for NPS. Although NPS staff have always been helpful.
- Be sure habitat evaluations are performed to severely limit habitat disturbance.

### **May Be Effective**

- Though this may lead to people jumping off the boardwalks and trampling fragile dune vegetation.
- Even with a lot and boardwalk, it is not practical to haul fishing gear, bathing gear, etc. up to a half mile and for cape point several miles. So, such areas not effectively utilized
- not in favor of expanded permanent parking lots; boardwalks. yes if well-designed and eco/eye friendly
- Expansion of parking lots and construction of boardwalks should be based upon observed usage. In all cases the potential impact on the dunes and the resource should be adequately considered
- If adequate ORV access is maintained, this would not be necessary. More beachside pavement would not be advisable and would be a detriment to the beauty of the park.
- Up to a point, carrying capacities for all users need to be addressed.
- But in only a few strategic places. too much maintenance
- Something needs to be done about bycatch (dead) being left on the beach.

### **Not Effective**

- Fisherman cannot carry all the equipment they need and handicapped and elderly persons would be at a complete disadvantage.
- Maximum public access for appropriate uses (including ORV access & use) with minimal restrictions to maintain safety and not destroy the resource should be the goal. Seasonal closures work; punish the few bad apples that violate rules
- Only use boardwalks to protect dunes. Their an eye soar.
- This is not a substitute for ORV use. Recreational fisherman have a lot of gear to haul. Walking a quarter mile and then dragging your gear through a minimum 200 yards of sand is not feasible.
- The beach is as is. Part of the experience is the sand
- More parking lots would do greater harm to the seashore than ORV use
- 1.I.1 - 1.I.4 are fine in their own right but not as an alternative to ORV use.
- Boardwalk from lots to beach would be very costly and seldom permanent. A well-maintained walking path is a better option.

**1.I.2** Build additional parking lots at strategic locations, such as adjacent to the villages.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Seems reasonable approach to expansion for pedestrian use of beach with minimal impact.
- Yes especially North of Rodanthe and North of Buxton. Pea Island is perfect.
- Keep disturbance in limited areas, especially until the T/E species return to recovery plan standards.
- Consider having an additional lot in Ocracoke halfway between the Ocracoke Day Use Area (north of Ramp 70) and the NPS Campground. The beach is closed to ORV's in the summer and the extra lot relieves pressure on the current ones.

- Just enlarge existing parking areas.

**(no selection)**

- Would assist only those who cannot drive off road.

**May Be Effective**

- This would allow tourist who are not staying in a village not feel like they are not able to enjoy the park unless they rent or buy a home.
- I need to know more to make a serious judgment about this. Would it be mostly villagers who would use them? Might a parking fee be charged?
- Only to accommodate high volume areas and limited to current developmental zones. Please save the green spaces.
- This alternative would provide passive users who do not own or rent in the villages access to passive use areas. Insofar as the village fronts extend for considerable distances, the availability of such parking should not be used as justification for closing village beaches off-season when shelter from the elements becomes essential to visitor enjoyment and overall usage is low. Finally, in all cases the potential impact on the dunes and the resource should be adequately considered.
- Up to a point, carrying capacities for all users need to be addressed.
- I am very skeptical of adding additional parking lots that may be used for only 30 days out of the year--at best! Additional parking lots should only be implemented through public opinion studies, etc. where the need to obvious and everyone is well served. The Canadian Hole south of Avon is a great example in recent years of providing parking that is needed. Do the same north of Rodanthe going into Pea Island.

**Not Effective**

- The lots to be effective and all year round will have to be of impervious material. This will impact the vegetation and water run off.
- More parking lots would do greater harm to the seashore than ORV use
- This will encourage people who are not staying on the island to come and use these facilities thus causing overburden.

**1.I.3 Provide parking and pedestrian access at some/all ORV access ramps.**

**Definitely Effective**

- Yes but only on a limited basis and should be based on volume and view. Keep it green
- Suggest pedestrian boardwalks adjacent to ORV ramps.
- Some, not all. There is not room for too much extra between ramps 27-34 due to narrow beach now. There are areas where it will be blocked by somebody on a towel above the high tide line.
- Parking and pedestrian access is available at all ORV access ramps
- Handicap accessibility

**May Be Effective**

- ramps themselves provide reasonable access for pedestrians
- Safety for pedestrian must be maintained
- Some access ramps are not applicable to pedestrian access due to the distance to the beach. As such, some ramps would not require pedestrian access.
- If pedestrians have their own ORV free areas then this is not necessary.
- Ramps should be situated where ORV beaches and where passive beaches meet. That would give passive users access to a beach with no ORV trails and it would give ORV users a place to get their gear straight, adjust tire pressure etc without blocking the ramp. Both user groups should share bathroom facilities.
- Some parking would be nice, especially for “groups” going out together, but I wouldn’t like to see each ramp become a pedestrian hang out spot.

#### **Not Effective**

- Think that separating ORV and pedestrian use may avoid conflicts and strengthen public safety concerns.
- I am reluctant to mix pedestrian activities with ORV use unless necessary for environmental reasons. May be a open door for increased conflict between these two user groups. Need to know about potential volumes and environmental affects
- I don't know what demand there is for pedestrian traffic. But I doubt there is much demand for more access along highway 12.
- This could be a safety concern; pedestrians would group near the ramp.
- Some ramps are not close enough to the ocean for thi to be effective.

**1.1.4** Work with Dare County to identify and increase public parking for beach access within the Hatteras Island villages.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- need to work with So. Shores especially.
- Seems like a win win – better for seashore, better for retail stores.
- An integrated total plan should be implemented.
- This area is needs more access definitely both ORV and passive areas.
- Dare county sure collects enough taxes from rentals to be able to help out with this
- Community input would be nice. The Seashore is not the only place visitors frequent.
- Yes but don't forget Hyde county

#### **May Be Effective**

- More parking is more impact to vegetation.
- good idea at all beaches

- Waterfront land is all privately owned so this sounds good but probably not practical. Unless all private roads are taken over to provide public parking.

#### **Not Effective**

- While public parking within Hatteras Island Villages would be desirable, based upon property values, this is not likely to be practicable
- This could cause a problem with visitors using private property. To access the beach. A public beach access would need to be established.

**1.I.5** Establish alternative transportation for Seashore visitors in sensitive resource areas such as Cape Point, Hatteras Spit, Bodie Island Spit, and South Point on Ocracoke Island. Alternative transportation could include: beach shuttles (e.g., authorize operators to shuttle visitors around closures) or boat shuttles to spits near marinas.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Gives everyone access to the shoreline
- But not to replace ORV use. However, would give everyone access to these areas.
- I support this if it includes shuttle of non-ORV visitors to the popular remote sites that are only accessible by ORV, ie Cape Point, Hatteras Spit, Bodie Island Spit, and South Point on Ocracoke Island. So all park visitors can enjoy these areas also.
- Alternative transportation options could create new economic opportunities for local economy and introduce visitors that do not have ORVs access to areas of the Park they might not have visited before.
- Seems effective for those who do not have an orv to at least see the point or hatteras inlet or other areas of the obx that is difficult to get to with an orv.. **BUT NOT AN ALTERNATIVE TO DRIVING ON THE BEACH.**

#### **May Be Effective**

- This would allow more people to experience the park, and could in theory cut down on traffic, similar to a mass transit system.
- This would not be effective for fishermen.
- This would be an area for an entrepreneur. The Park could sell a license to allow operation of such a business.
- I chose may be effective because this was suggested as an alternative to ORV usage, I am not in favor of any option that could lead to denial of ORV usage.
- Worth considering,, but must be practical and convenient while minimizing adverse impact on resources.
- Sounds like a good idea, especially to move people around closures. But what vehicles would be used? Where would people be picked up and delivered? What sort of schedules? Daily? Fees? Staffing? What are the potential environmental impacts of this option?
- May be effective for tourists seeking rec areas. Fisherman accustomed to ORV use will not use them
- The areas you mention are already 'very high use' areas during the summer. Additional people via shuttles, etc... would only add to the problem of it being overcrowded. Not to exclude people without ORVs the pleasure of experiencing the The Point, etc... but, careful consideration on this suggestion is needed.

- Assume the alternate transportation is for non-ORV users. Some folks buy boats to pacify their hobby. I bought a ORV to surf fish.
- Consider benefits of an Alternate 'taxi' service to be provided by NPS or NPS certified Private Contractors( shallow boat, ORV,etc ). This service would be designed to provide the best experience for the visitor(CUSTOMER) with the Best impact on our environment
- Effective only for physically disabled people.

### **Not Effective**

- The additional hassle and limitations of such a system will serve to severely restrict usage. Also there will be considerable addition costs associated with such a system.
- This would be impractical due to weather, closures, sea state. Both land and water borne shuttles would be high risk, and low volume used.
- If the passenger has no gear this might work, but who goes to the beach without fishing gear, beach items, etc.
- Would limit the access times and what one person could bring along.
- These areas should be restricted to ORV use
- This presents a huge expense and a liability issue and does not seem to be very practical
- if shuttles can safely avoid closures, then why can't an educated private ORV operator do the same?
- This could also crowd the area. ORV access only is what keeps the area from being over crowded. Beach shuttles could bring in droves of people. I believe people choose Hatteras Island because of it's remoteness. It stays that way because of the difficulty in reaching places like Cape Point without 4wd. Open it up to shuttles and you get more people tempted to run off to the dunes as they are anonymous. A 4wd owner can be traced back to their vehicle.
- considering the amount of equipment required by many recreational users i.e fisherman and the range of hours they use the resource this would not be a feasible option
- beach shuttles, water shuttles are impractical due to weather and water conditions surrounding the spits. Shuttles are a liability nightmare
- No no no 1000 times no. People could be stranded and injured out on the point during a sudden storm.
- Visitors to Cape Hatteras have ORVs or use walk over ramps.
- ORV's are available to rent at local businesses. Waste of taxpayers money
- Let's not even go there. It is a non-starter. There is NO-WAY I could carry what I would need to fish a tide at the Point, in one trip(arm load) cooler, bait, trash bag, water, food, tackle box, rods, sand spikes, chair, and more.
- Alternative transportation is not practicable for a wide variety of reasons, including weather, cost, manpower, ineffectiveness in transporting fishing gear, liability issues, etc.
- not effective due to weather and the schduleing,mmost people want to come and go on the on schdule..you have all theses people on the beach and a thunder stom comes up..how do you get them off
- This will never work. If areas need to be shut down they should be shut down as long as there are other access points

- Seriously, that's just stupid. This would represent a massive waste of money in salaries for drivers, cost of and maintenance of suitable vehicles, INSURANCE, fuel, etc. This solution would be totally unacceptable. It would turn the nicest national seashore into an amusement park. ORV users are responsible and do not operate their vehicles inside of resource closures.
- Not real sure about this. Sounds good until you dig deeper and envision trams and boatloads of people gawking at the nesting shorebirds. Then a 15 min pause for picture taking and off go the birds off the nest. Would save on gas and emissions. But lots more on the down side for this.
- Beach shuttles/boat shuttles would not be effective. Visitors must leave beaches immediately when weather is threatening. Five people drowned when a water taxi/shuttle flipped and sank during a wind gust from a sudden onset thunderstorm/microburst in 2004.
- this is not Seashore's responsibility.
- Having alternative routes to these areas will be more effective. With the large volume of visitor traffic, it would take a large number of shuttles to provide transportation for everyone. This would be like having a ferry across Oregon Inlet instead of the Bonner Bridge.
- What's the point in this? Boating tourists around the soundfront and causing further degradation to the integrity of the ecosystem? I'd say no. Definitely no shuttle services.
- Shuttles are horrible at best, and a legal morass at worst. They would be private enterprise would have to be 4wd, would have to accommodate large numbers of people and lot of tackle, coolers, ect. During runs of drum, blues, stripers. Many times the best bites are late at night when shuttles may not run. They would be expensive to maintain and people using them would be charged high fees. Boat shuttles not even viable due to weather shifts / front we experience
- Due to WX, some areas should have alternative access routes, not public transportation.
- This would limit the items (fishing equipment, surfboards, beach chairs, coolers, etc.) that people could take to the beach.
- I do not agree with this alternative for many reasons. First and foremost, I am opposed to ORV shuttle services on the beach. I believe this is a bit too "Disney" and will detract from natural or "in the wild" aspect of the visitor experience. Furthermore, I have never heard even the slightest outcry that the non ORV public wants a non ORV way to access the areas mentioned. In addition I suggest the make up of the shoreline is not easily conducive to boat shuttles and will interfere with recreational activities by beach users. Enhancement of parking areas and walk on access will provide access for walk on users. From a protection of sensitive areas perspective, no parking ORV corridors, escort services and other methods are better options. Finally, shuttle services will increase the number of visitors to these sensitive areas. I will suggest that shuttles on paved roads are a good idea, especially when linked with the need for more parking areas. Large off site parking lots could shuttle walk on users to locations throughout the park minimizing user conflict with ORV's and distributing users to less sensitive areas.

## **1.J. Access for Commercial Fishing**

**1.J.1** Allow commercial fishing permit holders to use ORVs for fishing access in seasonal and safety closures but not resource closures. (*status quo*)

### **Definitely Effective**

- Commercial fisher are usually local citizens and should have the same access rights. Better monitoring of their deadly netting systems is needed to prevent the lost of valuable fish resources that may be out of season or under sized.

- This was guaranteed by the enabling legislation I think.

### **May Be Effective**

- There should be a limit on this.
- Effective if permits are issued strictly and not to bogus applicants.
- A few areas should be off limits. I would consider 200 yards from fishing piers and some other selected areas but generally commercial fishermen that are legal residents of the villages should be allowed in passive recreational areas to commercial fish.
- Access for commercial beach fishing is a non issue because, in my experience, there is very little commercial beach fishing any more.
- I do not feel as though commercial fisherman are held accountable. Nets break or are let to go through areas such as the point – no ticket etc. Let that happen to anyone else. Really feel beach commercial fishing should be outlawed as in Florida. This type of commercial fishing is not economical favorable nor helpful.

### **Not Effective**

- You should take a page form our reg here in md and keep the commercial guys at least 3 miles off shore at all times
- Allowing any ORV use in closed areas negates the benefits of the closure. When an area is closed for valid reasons then it should be closed to all.
- There should be no gill net fishing off the shoreline anywhere in the Park. This activity is destructive of fish stock and in some instances, commercial operations leave fish carcass along the shore line.
- Fish resources of all kinds should be protected. Recent viewing of gill netting was very destructive to fish stock. At a minimum, there should be a requirement to return all unwanted fish to the water as they are pulled out.
- commercial fishermen should have no more rights than recreational anglers
- My understanding is that such activity would adversely impact winter habitat of endangered species.
- Seasonal should be closed for pedestrian use. Safety- let them decide but they should be held commercially accountable for damages incase of a mishap
- Commercial fishing access in all areas other than resource closures is part of the enabling legislation (comment repeated for 1.J.2-1.J5)
- No netting from the beach!!
- Safety closures are for ‘safety’.
- commercial fishing from the beach needs to end. If we are worried about some tire tracks and an ORV driving over a beach towel, then commercial fishermen need to do their thing from a boat. I am not opposed to guides taking surf fishermen on the beach.
- Would prefer that all vehicles (except safety) be kept out of seasonal and safety closures. Just don’t need pickups and trailered boats going through a crowd of beachgoers chasing a school of mullet.
- Commercial activities should be banned from federal and state owned lands

**1.J.2** Revise types of closures commercial fishermen may enter with ORVs.

**Definitely Effective**

- make them consistent with recreational access
- A free permit is already issued by the Seashore. There is a low number of these currently issued. Could easily be revisited.
- Needs to be visited – like what Florida has done.
- Keep commercial fishing out of seasonal and safety closed areas.

**May Be Effective**

- Allow legitimate access to legitimate commercial fishermen only.

**Not Effective**

- Allowing any ORV use in closed areas negates the benefits of the closure. When an area is closed for valid reasons then it should be closed to all.
- NC law allows this activity and so does the original park documents

**[no selection]**

- I don't think ORV use is the issue here. And if closures are in place, they should apply to commercial as well as recreational fishing.

**1.J.3** If passive recreation areas are designated, allow commercial fishermen access through them by ORVs consistently through the Seashore.

**May Be Effective**

- All ORVs must be restricted from heavily used passive recreation areas to avoid safety and legal problems and reduce user conflict.

**Not Effective**

- Allowing any ORV use in closed areas negates the benefits of the closure. When an area is closed for valid reasons then it should be closed to all. If commercial fisherman can pass then so can all others.
- commercial fishermen should have no more rights than recreational anglers
- Separate passive recreation areas from ORV activity.
- If the commercial fisherman vehicles are marked, this will keep any confusion and complaints to a minimum and keep non-commercial fisherman from thinking "if he can do it I can"
- I am reluctant to mix passive recreation uses and users with ORVs (even commercial fishermen) at any time if there are reasonable alternatives. It is likely commercial fishermen have other alternatives available
- Passive areas are there primarily for safety .. thus, the commercial ORVs should not have access.
- I have seen this practice lead to confrontations.
- The passive areas should be purely passive.

- I am an environmentalist, not a tree hugger, but commercial fisherman are not held responsible enough. There access on the beach and even commercial fishing from boats needs to have a limit to how close they make come to the beach. Even as a rec. fisherman I have no problem with catch and release for many species.

**1.J.4** If passive recreation areas are designated, restrict commercial fishermen access through them by ORVs consistently through the Seashore.

**Definitely Effective**

- Passive recreation should trump commercial activities.
- Keep passive areas passive only.
- This type of fishing is done by too many part time commercial fishermen --- doubtful as to monetary benefit. Needs to be researched.

**May Be Effective**

- Could meet some objectives, but for the most part the commercial fisherman's intent and usage is of a different nature than recreational users of the park.
- Would largely be a safety issue
- May need area by area rules (develop standards).

**Not Effective**

- Would require additional access ramps
- If its open then it should be open to all ORV. If its closed then its closed to all.
- As long as there are defined rules for fishermen and consequences for breaking the rules.

**1.J.5** If passive recreation areas are designated, allow or restrict commercial fishermen access through them by ORVs on an area-specific basis.

**Definitely Effective**

- Surf fishermen and commercial fishermen usually come into conflict when commercial fishermen are using nets close to the beach in heavily fished surf fishing areas. These areas could be limited from land based access points to minimize the conflict.

**May Be Effective**

- Only for safety or environmental reasons.
- The more populated areas should be considered closed. Then again who is this decision left up to, the commercial fisherman?
- Would largely be a safety issue
- Might be worth a trial. But allowing one class of user special privileges would encourage abuse and violations

**Not Effective**

- Commercial fishermen have to be able to get to those areas to make a living, it would not be fair to them to limit their access.
- How would one decide?
- Allowing any ORV use in closed areas negates the benefits of the closure. When an area is closed for valid reasons then it should be closed to all.
- commercial fishermen should have no more rights than recreational anglers
- Keep passive areas passive only.

### **Additional comments regarding ORV management:**

- The number of both passive and ORV users will continue to grow. The plan needs to find ways to expand areas available to all visitors. The use of the closed areas on Pea Island particularly at the north end adjacent to Oregon Inlet should be considered.
- To restrict orv access would be a large negative financial blow to the island
- I appreciate the chance to give feedback on such an important issue. I realize that this issue is one that has many elements. I feel that the way the NPS has handled it so far has been impressive. I believe you can't make everyone happy and the NPS has done a good job of sticking with the issues that matter, safety, stewardship, environmental awareness, and the ability for people to enjoy the park in many different ways. I simply wanted to commend Mike Murray and everyone else who has taken the time to approach this issue like it should and doing an outstanding job of being a true government employee.
- Preserving the natural beauty, wildlife, commercial fishing traditions, and the privilege of the public to enjoy the seashore of the North Carolina Outer banks is an enormous task that requires many difficult decisions. As a frequent user of the OBX beaches, I would be devastated to see public access severely limited. Most of the people who use the beaches do so in a responsible manner. For those who do not, increase the penalties. As for the wildlife preservation areas, please use real and practical scientific data to close areas for protection of species. I have seen areas closed for extended periods and virtually no wildlife activity within the areas. Please do not make fishermen feel like the endangered species. Work to involve the public in activities that will help improve the beaches, clean up projects with a fishing or surfing tournament involved. It is the people who use the beaches who can do the most to keep them clean and preserve the natural beauty for future generations. Thank you for this forum!
- These are well-presented alternatives. I am skeptical about enforcement of any changes, because of existing tensions and disregard of NPS rules. Whatever the plan looks like at the end of the process, there must be a transition period to adapt to changes. Whatever the plan looks like at the end of the process, it will be better if it is realistic, not idealistic.
- The Park was initially established as a recreational area and it needs to be kept that way.
- All efforts should be made by NPS to ensure that the maximum area is available for ORV access at all times. I am Certain that Pea Island has areas that are not environmentally sensitive to allow mitigation of temporary closures by expanding available access on Pea Island for ORV usage.
- In my opinion, more access needs to be granted... including to Pea Island. More access means less concentration of ORV in smaller areas. 99.9% of ORV are responsible. Punish the one's that are not and let the rest of use enjoy our country. Punish them severely and revoked their ORV privileges but don't punish the one's who don't screw up. Most folks will agree with this. Set aside areas that are needed for the birds and turtles and we will respect them. No big deal. Let us be free to fish, cookout, or whatever... but let us be free. God knows we all pay enough taxes for our freedom but we still have to fight daily in some way for it.

- 1. The current ORV policies are time tested and generally meet the needs of public usage. 2. Additional parking and walk-over points will reduce the need for more ORV control. 3. Additional sanitation needs to be provided with many more rest rooms 4. Clearly marked ORV routes will provide additional safety in high usage areas. 5. The NPS needs flexibility in its plan to provide for changing conditions. 6. NPS should not restrict ORV access unless absolutely necessary such as in high usage times. 7. Everyone should have convenient access to the shore line. Supplemental transportation is a plus
- By and large, present usage works. There are certain times of the year when usage increases considerably and additional planning should be implemented. The requirements can be quite simple-there is no need for massive change. In high use areas , there could be designated travel corridors and speed limits, which would greatly alleviate safety concerns. This would only be needed when congestion is high and would not need to apply year round. I do not believe that ORV use damages the beach. Traces of ORV use vanish quickly with tides, wind, rain, storms.
- ORV use is very important to the economic viability of the entire area and needs to be continued on a year round basis
- I feel a balance between the wants and desires of those who want to keep wildlife safe from human intrusion and those who want access to fish and enjoy the beach should be made. The current schematics seem to be adequate , in my opinion. The plovers are protected during their mating season, as well as sea turtles. I mainly want to be able to go to a place that is hard to access except for with ORV. This is a quiet beautiful place. I am distressed by a recent order by a Judge who wants to take this quiet beautiful place away from me. This order made because of one person's actions. This one person drove in environmentally sensitive areas. I am very angry over his actions. I am equally angry at this judge. He should punish the law breaker and not me. In my opinion the solution to most problems concerning the beach is that the laws concerning the destruction of nature are not enforced adequately. Maybe require a fee for beach access (not a permit I do not want the number of people restricted) and use this money to hire more rangers ect. to police the areas.
- We all love and respect this valuable resource and want to have access to it. We also need to have a good management plan to protect it. The NPS needs the flexibility to establish rules that protect the resource for each of us and that flexibility is important because the weather can change conditions in this area in a short period of time. As a fisherman it's hard to see the beaches closed because a single Piping Plover has nested with two chicks but I understand why it's import that we make sure that we provide the resources necessary for that birds survival. I only ask that the NPS use better judgment when that nest is no longer viable in reopening that area of beach. The Outer Banks have been a wonderful resource for all of us for a very long time and I would not like to see access to it closed. We all know that you have a very tough job and also want to express appreciation for the job that you are doing
- I feel that the Park should be open for responsible ORV use, more ramps should be open for safety reasons. There is room in the Park for the different group to coexist. More educational programs are needed to inform visitors about the need to protect the threatened and endangered species. Enforcement of Park rules is much needed.
- Safety and seasonal closures are reasonable and are working. The access for legally compliant users should be maintained as a top priority. Humans are the most important animal to use these beaches. Unless there is irrefutable proof that such use will cause permanent irreversible destruction, ORV access should be maintained.
- On the whole I found the options listed under this title quite unsatisfying. That was true largely because none of the options had any data or conclusions as to why they are proposed or what effects they might have. Many of the options standing alone seem reasonable and perhaps workable, but many of them also have inter-relationships and potential conflicts with other possibly reasonable choices. Many of the options sound reasonable, but would entail substantial new or added money or staff to carry out. Again, all options (above all in a preferred alternative) need to be feasible and represent something more than pipe dreams. I realize it may take considerable time to phase desirable choices in, but such choices require a clear set of defined priorities over time.
- Establish and maintain consistent enforcement rules and make all aware; especially tourists who only want to ride on the beaches. Remove the hostile relationships that have developed with fishermen. Do not allow specialty groups to dictate policy or make them exemption from the rules.

- Hatteras is special to a lot of people. I don't think I would spend my time and money there if I could not surf fish. Its not about catching, its about the time spent. I don't know what would happen to the local economy. But fishing is a big part of it. I don't think I could take all the gear and kids if I had to haul it all on my back. Some people want to remove the human element from the beach and just leave it natural. The island belong to individuals before Paul Mellon and his friend bought much of it and donated it to the park services. I thought there was an agreement made to the people that their way of life would not be severely impacted.
- Provide additional enforcement of the existing rules
- the many questions posed above had much to do with areas currently permitting ORV usage. Nothing was asked directly about other areas such as the beach side of the Pea Island area. If this workbook is trying, in a even handed manner to develop an ORV plan for the full Cape Hatteras National Seashore then all parts of the territory must be included. The ocean side of Pea Island should be open to ORVs.
- I am going to forward to you a copy of an email I sent to Mike Murray at NPS for your information and consideration should we need to address the ORV access issue from the standpoint of control and elimination of rogue individuals.
- The ORV plan needs to be fair and equitable to both ORV and Non-ORV use. I have been visiting and fishing the OB for 45 years. I have property there and understand both the eco-system and the conservation issues. A total closure and further restrictions of the beach would be catastrophic to the local economy as well as to the visitors. The current ORV status quo for the most part is working. The current plan allows for visitors to enjoy sites and recreation that would otherwise not be accessible without further development or infra structure roads, ramps and parking lots. The development of more ramps, turnouts, and parking lots need be well planned and strategically developed. The rustic nature of the area as it is now is a major attraction to visitors. This charm should not be disrupted with large turnouts, and expansion or future development of parking lots. Strategic development on a limited basis is warranted but it must be well planned and thought out. A few more ramps, turnouts, and well designed parking areas would provide more alternatives and choices to better manage closures and restrictions and still provide open access for ORV use. The location of these ramps and structures certainly does not need to be every two miles. Public restrooms and other building structures are not warranted on a wide scale basis, but should be considered on a limited basis and should be clustered around the most used passive areas. Large scale expansion of passive areas are also desired or needed, but may considered on a limited basis based on the villages and the housing areas that are already developed. Personnel watercraft should continue to not be allowed along any of the beaches on both the ocean and sounds. The current status quo vehicle traffic is not damaging the environment.
- I have been going to the Outer Banks for well over 30 years now and have seen many changes. Not only are there 50 times more buildings than I ever thought possible, There are more visitors down in one week than I saw my first 10 yrs combined. The traffic on hwy 12 is almost at its limits and the beach is more crowded than ever. I still can't think of any place on the great planet I would rather spend my vacations. I do long for the days when you could drive the beach for miles and never see another person, or even tire tracks where one had been since the last tide change. I am aware that a treasure such as the Outer Banks Seashore could not be kept a secret forever and I am more that willing to share this wonderful place with all that is willing to take care of it. I have seen the beach come and go. I have seen the point move north to south and back again. I have even seen the mighty lighthouse make a historical journey south. The one thing I could not have ever been prepared for is the thought of not having access to this wonderful place. In my 30 some years I have seen a great many changes, most for the good and some not so good. I have seen folks at there best and some at there not so best. I have witnessed ORVer stopping to give rides to the walk over vacationers that walked a bit too far away for the little ones to make it back in the burning sand. I have seen ORVers coming off the beach with a truck bed full of debris that was left by others or washed up. I have helped pull old nets out of the surf and load on my truck to prevent it from drifting down through the swimming areas. I have seen ORVer and helped myself fill in holes left by walk over vacationers and others. I can't imagine the beaches without ORVs. They are not only part of the history, but should be part of the present as well as part of the future. So, I believe that ORV management is a must and should be enforced. I think the rules we have now are very close to what rules will work far into the future and the NPS should refer to the past in efforts to plan for the future. The beaches of Hatteras have been a part of my life for a long time and I want it to continue to be so. I would never do anything to harm the beaches or anything on them. I understand that for a few weeks a year, the beaches are at a maximum capacity and that is why I don't chose to go then. I also know that other times of the season, traffic is light and the beach hardly knows anyone is there. I can only hope the NPS is wise enough to see that over restricting the ORVs will do way more damage than good, not only to the island businesses but to the entire island.

- It should be kept in mind that the majority ORV users wish to preserve the resources as much as anyone. However, restricting and targeting ORV users is not the answer. Most ORV users abide by the rules, laws & regulations set forth. We should not regulate and restrict the majority for the abuse of a minority. We should however, punish the violators better than we do. Revisions of the fine & punishment structure may be better served than defining the management plan to address the abusers. Secondly, these plans are targeted at the intelligent species, MAN, to protect the animals. It seems little attention is being given to addressing the increase in nature predators to various species.
- I'm interested in additional beach access for ORVs. I believe that a plan can be put in place to permit all user groups more access to our beaches. I do consider certain areas during peak summer times to be very sensitive to ORV access. As such, I understand that some conditions must apply during these periods. A plan should provide the bypass of certain areas with interdunal roads, beach corridors and/or bypass means where possible. The posted speed limit on the beach is 25 mph. I would like to see the posted speed limit reduced on interdunal roads and beach corridors to reduce the risk of accidents.
- In the case of beach closures for turtle and bird resource protection, The closures should be flexible in scope and approached with common sense. Closures should only be set up when the birds or turtles are present. None of us have a crystal ball and should not pretend we can know exactly where this wildlife may come and nest. When these animals choose to nest very close to the tidal zone, relocation of the eggs and in some cases animal should be relocated to a safer environment where they are not in danger damaged by high water/waves due to storms/wind which is frequent. Closures should also be flexible to allow through access for ORV's and should not extend into the tidal zone. If the closure boundary needs to be extended in a particular direction, the boundary should be decreased in the opposite direction (consistent maximum closure size with some exceptions).
- At some point in time there will be damage to existing ocean front structures. There needs to be an established policy(s) regarding what may be erected, set backs from the high tide mark, re-building, federal flood policy and
- Keeping the ramps and interdunal roads open and FREE should be the number one priority. Go after the people who fail to follow the rules but reward the ones who practice safe beach access.
- Most people I know are very respectful of the beaches, including the physical attributes (dunes, etc) and the wildlife. The need for seasonal closures due to nesting birds, for example, is understood and although, not liked at times, can be accepted. The vast minority ... those few who violate ... those that do not care ..... and those that continually show a level of disrespect should be targeted. Citations/fines .. including permanent restriction for use of the NPS should be considered. I realize that administration of this is labor and cost intensive but, regardless, is something we need. I have no issue paying an annual fee to use the Cape Hatteras National Seashore .... assuming these funds could be direct to better ORV management. Also, setup a 'citizens patrol', of sorts .... let us, under the direction of NPS management help in keeping things in order. This is such a unique place within the USA .... most people will do anything within their reach to help keep it that way.
- Provide ATV access along with the ORV plan, remove the helmet requirement on beach same as farming operation or engaged in the act of hunting. 25 mph speed limit on beach combined with the act of fishing usually during the summer heat along with the salt spray from the ocean is not a safety issue. The helmet requirement should be removed.
- It is very important that ORV access be maintained on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation area. There have been many closures and restrictions over the years that have reduced the ORV accessible areas tremendously. Any additional closures will contribute to overcrowding on the remaining open beaches.
- The economy of the OBX is dependent upon tourism. ORV use is linked with tourism. Any detrimental restriction on ORV use will affect the well fare of OBX year round residents.
- Wherever National Seashores were contemplated it is certain surf anglers worked very hard to insure establishment of these areas as they were all established as "National Seashore Recreation Areas." Fishermen all along the coast thought our future was secure under NPS management. In a report entitled "Status of National Seashores on the U.S. East Coast as of Summer 1970" prepared for the Chief Scientist, National Park Service by Dr. Paul J. Godfrey,

University of Massachusetts are many salient points. Two quotes are important here: “In Recreation Areas just about anything goes as long as recreation needs are met.” And from the NPS Administrative Policies, page 78 is: “Resource Management: Outdoor recreation shall be recognized as the dominant or primary resource management objective. Natural resources within the area may be utilized and managed for additional purposes where such additional uses are compatible with fulfilling the recreation mission of the area. Scenic, historical, scientific, scarce, or disappearing resources within recreation areas shall be managed compatible with the primary recreation mission of the area.” What happened? We anglers that worked to establish National Seashore Recreation Areas have been betrayed. We feel like our Native Americans when the Fort Laramie Treaties were broken, again our government in action. At our National Seashore Recreation Areas we were free to enjoy ourselves. National Seashores of today are by and large a police state with rules and regulations for everything. This is clearly demonstrated by the size and complexity of this Workbook.

- The main problem I have had in recent years is I plan a trip (a week or more) gear up travel from my home to the beach and there are massive beach closures everywhere I try to go. This has gotten worse every year. I understand we have to protect our wildlife but somebody's getting carried away with this. There is also something going on you don't hear much about that is people like me picking up trash, filling in holes and really trying to take care of the beach are doing this from our ORV'S.
- The entire seashore should remain a primitive recreational area. The addition of handicap access ramps, toilet facilities, shuttle service, escorted or guided tours and the like should not be allowed beyond those that currently exist. Recreation use is time-dependent and all-inclusive. You may sunbathe, swim, or picnic during summer daylight hours; fish, swim, star-gaze, beach comb or walk/jog year round (night or day); recreationally harvest clams, crabs, scallops and oysters (in season, year round); gig flounder at night; casting nets to capture bait fish or shrimp; surfboarding (in all forms) year round; and kayaking, canoeing, boogey boarding, boating, or rafting. Such recreational activities require year-round access to both the Atlantic Ocean and Pamlico Sound. Since Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area is fragmented by several islands and separated by a wildlife refuge and two ocean inlets, access is mostly limited to the use of motorized vehicles, bicycles, or boating. Without highway 12, ORV use is mandatory; particularly true for permanent residents of the 8 villages. Park visitors and residents, in pursuit of recreational activities, almost exclusively use ORV's to access the ocean beaches and sounds.
- I agree with closing beaches in front of the villages to ORV's during high occupancy season, e.g. May 15<sup>th</sup> to October 15<sup>th</sup>. These areas should be open to ORVs the rest of the time. Pea Island should remain closed to ORV's. Pea Island has plenty of beach for those who want to have some privacy without ORV traffic. It should also be kept the way it is for wildlife and birds.
- Life has consequences, the beach has to be shared by all users. If your ORV is not adequate, do not drive it out onto the beach, a soft sand beginning of each and every ramp will screen these vehicles out, provide a ramp wide enough to get around somebody awaiting a tow. Most of the fishermen who drive out to the Point have spent tens of thousands of dollars to have trucks and equipment to fish that beach. Not everybody has an ORV that can be driven on the beach, that's a decision on their part, not yours. Inadequacy should not be rewarded. If additional money is available for any of the above, signage is cheap and effective. Next is drainage at the Point campground. It has been since Isabel that the salt water has not been allowed to go back to the ocean. This has killed a thriving freshwater swamp and is getting close to salting the wells in Buxton. Third parking in and next to the villages for in-season use by non oceanfront renters and visitors. As well as increases in parking lot size at lifeguarded beaches. Let me speak about what God(Mother Nature) does. When a storm comes & overwashes the Point, sand is gained and in some cases lost. It is the loss of beach I am worried about. (The following numbers are for demonstration only) The beach is 10,000sq. yds the bird enclosure is 6000sq.yds. An overwash storm takes 3000sqyds of the remaining 4000sqyds of fishing beach and also takes 3000sq.yds of the bird enclosure. As it is now, the bird enclosure will be put back to 4000sqyds and the fishing beach will be gone. Since there is less beach to share it should be split equitably between the birds and fishermen. Neither can have it all. The bird areas need to be addressed in several ways; size, and length of closure, both pre-nesting and nesting times & size. This will be very hard to do, but I like to see it happen. Clearing the grasses & brush around the pond at the Point will allow birds to have additional feeding areas. Clearing the grasses & brush between the pond and ramp 45 will open up huge amounts of beach for nesting/resting. As it stands now this area is closed year round. Grasses & weeds are growing closer to the fence & the tide line squeezing the fishermen out. Something new HAS to be tried. NPS, USFW have demonstrated the present course doesn't work well. Increasing ORV access doesn't cost any money to promote. It will promote itself. NPS will be congratulated.

- With the exception of some much needed maintenance, addition of rest rooms, garbage disposal, and the restoration of lost access, it is not broke don't fix it.
- I Love to fish and visit on the Outer Banks... Access is Important and PERSONAL... I'm just as important as a fish or a bird.
- I prefer to have the continued availability of the all non village NPS beaches for ORV use except for the interruption due to wildlife preservations. For such interruptions, alternative access should be the next priority.
- Compromise is obviously necessary. ORV enthusiasts can still park their ORV's and use passive areas but the opposite is not true. Passive users are less likely to use ORV areas for obvious reasons. Improve the passive areas and make the beach accessible to everyone including the handicapped. Passive areas should be totally free of ORV's. In the off season, allow ORV areas more access but keep the village areas free of ORV's. These should be passive only. Empower the resource users to keep the beaches clean and safe. CHNS must be protected so resource closures must occur, but access must not be unfairly restricted. Keep the costs under control as much as possible but improvements to ramp areas are necessary. Whatever rules come about allow the plan to be flexible so that changes can be made if things are not working as planned. HOWEVER, special interest groups should not be allowed the use their vast money resources to influence the plan. Compromise and adapt to give all users equal access to this beautiful resource and protect it for future generations. Empower the people to protect and self police the resource. As people adopt roads and keep them clean, create an adoption plan for ORV and Passive areas. Keep the public actively involved. Educational programs should expanded to teach young and old about the resource area. This will ensure future protection of the resource. The "green movement" is occurring everywhere now. All improvements to the Seashore should be as green as possible. COMPROMISE,EQUAL ACCESS,FLEXIBILITY,NO INFLUENCE BY SPECIAL INTERESTS,PUBLIC EMPOWERMENT TO PROTECT THE RESOURCE,IMPROVE RAMPS AND MAKE SURE IMPROVEMENTS ARE "GREEN". MAKE THIS AN AREA FOR EVERYONE, AND MAKE EVERYONE'S RESPONSIBLE FOR THE RESOURCE THROUGH EDUCATION AND HANDS ON INVOLVEMENT.
- All parties involved need to include the affect on the local businesses that this will have if changes are made . The potential is there that this would increase the "red tape" required to use the beach and as a result could reduce the number of vacationers that would visit the Outer Banks. I agree that we need to review how the shore is currently being used but people have been coming to the Outer Banks for years and to now put limits on how many people can use the beach is a little ridiculous. We have been coming to the Outer Banks for approximately 20 years and have enjoyed each experience but if the NPS places more restrictions on what we can do we may have to decide if it is worth coming to the Outer Banks. We hope that an agreement can be made that all parties can abide by and will be beneficial to all parties.
- I appreciate the opportunity to comment. I just bought a home in Buxton to use as a second home for about a year with plans to retire then. I have been coming to Hatteras Island for years predominately for off season surf fishing. I look forward to your results.
- I am hesitant to comment on any of the direct options provided by those who composed this workbook as the agenda behind them is unknown to the public. However, it does seem that this situation can be managed within the two extremes; one, extreme being shutting down the beach entirely to ORV use and the second extreme, not progressing from the *status quo*. Perhaps, introducing a second license-to-fish within specific boundaries may work best. If the mandatory purchasing of a second license were put into place then fishing would lessen and discipline could more easily be enforced to those who purchased a second license. In other words, investing in an additional license would also mean gaining some environmental responsibilities and privileges. The park service could easily withhold ones license if rules were broken and responsibilities were not upheld. Completely shutting down the beach to ORVs, or designating the area as a critical habitat would destroy several people financially and emotionally. As you know, surf fishing has been a vital aspect of the OBX economy. Acting without sufficient scientific evidence would prove unethical and immoral.
- I think everyone can benefit from a well balanced management system. I also believe it is beneficial to have ORV's on the beach, most ORV users come prepared, especially the campers, we are self contained and carry plenty of supplies whether it be first aid for a young child with a cut on the foot from a shell or the occasional use of the restroom. In the past I and my friends have helped a lot of people with problems on the beach. In an emergency we

can take people off the beach what ever the cause – I wouldn't hesitate to help. With the modern day cell phone available – having ORV's on the beach is a good communication tool whether it be a stranded mammal or a swimmer that is in trouble- someone can be notified!

- Increasing ORV use of the National Seashore continues to discourage families and individuals who cannot or have no desire to drive motorized vehicles on the beach. A very large and respectful segment of users is being ignored in favor of allowing ORV use by a privileged few. Providing more parking like the lots on Pea Island will allow users to reach the beaches without vehicles. This includes people who want to fish from the beach. Before widespread use of ORVs and SUVs, fishermen walked their gear to the beach. There is no reason why they can't do that now. The National Seashore is not a highway. It is intended to be preserved for future generations as a natural area. Increasing access for ORVs promises lawsuits that will be an unnecessary burden on NPS staff and taxpayers.
- Regarding safety I see little justification for closing the areas in front of the villages year round to ORVs. The Northern beaches, (Nags Head, etc.), have much more off season pedestrian traffic than the Seashore. Thus it is hard to imagine a safety problem that would justify such a year round closure within the Seashore when it does not seem to be a problem to the North where off season ORV use is allowed. It is my opinion that safety is a ruse being used in an effort to essentially privatize village beaches. Even though some "public" accesses exist in the villages (only the privately funded walkways approved by NPS that cross NPS land), there is essentially no parking available at these accesses. Thus unless a person is living/staying in a house very near one of these accesses, there is no practical way to use the accesses. So if ORVs are limited in these beach areas, only those near the accesses will have practical access to these beaches in the off season. Thus the beach would essentially belong to those living/staying along it. Note: There are no public funded public accesses within the villages. All foot paths and boardwalks that end at the NPS boundary are private. Only the privately funded boardwalks that are approved by NPS are "Public". The owner of the approved walk cannot restrict public access but if there is no place to park, so what. I feel that a narrow beach should be closed only when it is clear that passage at low tide is impossible without traveling on the toe of the dune. Thus it would be a resource protection issue, not safety. Perhaps the signs at the ramps should be expanded to indicate that driving on the dunes is a serious offense that will be punished accordingly and such driving, even to save a vehicle from the water, will not be tolerated. Maybe posting such a larger sign at the resource closure, like is done for some wildlife/plant closures, is appropriate as a reminder.
- I've been coming to Hatteras Island since 1976. I've been driving on that beach since 1989. Every year my family and I spend at least 4-5 weeks in Avon, and we explore the island to its fullest, and are able to do so because of the ORV access. Tradition is sometimes ignored, but in this case, it seems foolish to limit the abilities of the native islanders and visitors to access the beach in their vehicles. The island is a fragile barrier for sure, the economy of the island is even more fragile and if we limit the ability of people to access the beaches in their ORV's, the economy and way of life will be altered. Possibly irreversibly altered. I do hope that a compromise can be made, that the traditions of families for generations will be allowed to proceed, and that the local economy will stay strong due to the freedom our National Seashore allows with driving on the beach.
- ORV access is a tradition at Cape Hatteras Recreation Area, access should be returned to areas that have been closed in recent years.
- No parking within 200 yards of a ramp. No parking in ORV trails, park vehicles in a way that does not obstruct access for others. Give Law Enforcement Rangers the responsibility to direct parking in ORV areas that increase accessibility and create order. No day or night camping on the beach. Designated areas where cooking may be allowed. Designated areas where pets on a leash are permitted. Limits the length of time a vehicle may park on high use beaches (ex. Cape Point). Prohibit adjusting air pressure on ramps (no airing down at ramps). Trash disposal and fish cleaning facilities should be out of sight and situated where they will not affect native species or attract predators, not where they are most convenient for users. Establish carrying capacities for all areas of the Seashore. Strictly enforce no driving on vegetation and wetlands. Do away with seasonal and non-seasonal use access areas in CHNS. Re-design the ramp system. There are too many ramps. They are inappropriate placed, designed and don't adequately move traffic. Too many ramps make it difficult to adequately protect and patrol the ocean beach. Keep the old ramps, where appropriate, to use as emergency ramps and consider the option to temporarily open appropriate ramps to provide ORV access to areas that are still open to ORV (use to detour around areas that have become temporarily closed to ORV access). Use the old ramp parking lots to expand Rt 12 passive access parking lots (ramp 34 and ramp 38 for an example). Rules should be enforceable with fines and penalties for non-compliance. ORV users should pass a written test taken on premise or at designated facility, (not a take home or mail in test) to

obtain an ORV permit. Fees for an ORV permit should be commensurate to all the cost of providing ORV access. Safety equipment similar to other National Seashores that allow ORV use should be standard on all vehicles in all National Seashores.

- I don't like the thought of having to get a permit to access my own back yard (I am a Dare County native), but don't see many viable ways around it. As ORV production grows, so does the number of ORV's on the Seashore. Fees, while ugly, proved the necessary funding to provide better access and increased law enforcement presence which is badly needed. We can't go back, but we can look at and learn from the past to build and protect the future of this unique area.
- The ORV plan must respect and value both human and wildlife use of CHNS. I am confident that ORV beach access and meaningful conservation of OBX wildlife can coexist because it's been happening successfully for years.
- The size of this workbook makes it almost overwhelming to the "normal" park visitor. Personally, I have started answering these questions on several occasions and quickly lose interest. The questions being posed lead me to believe, the resulting actions are predetermined. Cape Hatteras is a national park and should be open to all visitors be they beach goers, bird watchers, recreational or commercial fisherman. All of the activities outlined are conducted by people with ORV's. ORV's are needed to gain access to "our" resource. I am 59 years old. My knees will no longer let me walk 2 to 3 miles through the sand. My ORV is necessary to allow access to me and my family. The only areas that should be closed are the life guarded beaches and temporary wild life nesting areas. Open the remaining areas and increase the both the penalties and fines for any illegal activities.
- It appears to me that in general our current options and the status quo work. Although I can appreciate the difficulty of planning for the future it appears to me that many of the options listed above are suggesting a definite move away from a relative pristine seashore as I have known it for almost 50 years to a "top heavy over organized, over signed entity which if implemented will destroy most of the charm that" this relatively unspoiled barrier island has projected since its inception. It will take on the attributes of a North Carolina Disneyworld. It seems to me that many of the anticipated problems could be handled by human personnel operating within somewhat rougher guidelines than you appear to be considering whereby they could handle situations on an individual and common sense basis. More parking places I agree with but the passive recreation zones suggested I believe should be generally not considered as such. If you can provide access to the beaches within the current village boundaries fine, however in the peak tourist seasons all of the villages, as well as Pea Island, in addition to the currently narrow beaches north of Buxton and around the lighthouse are in fact passive use areas. Under the current seashore situation passive access can be greatly increased by utilizing the old washed out roads for parking and access rather than closing them down. The N.C. Highway department has "no parking signs" on Highway 12 North of Buxton, and North of Hatteras Village. These are places where passive recreation should be encouraged by providing easier access. At present there are parking facilities at every ramp on Hatteras Island. To enlarge these parking facilities makes sense, but don't diminish the value of the ramp to ORVs by blocking access because of a passive area. At the present time orv traffic generally voluntarily doesn't intrude intentionally on walkover users. On the other hand if passive areas were established next to the ramps and there was excess intrusion then make it passive only for 50-75 yards but still allow access to the beach which is further away.
- I do believe that the current superintendent Mike Murray has done an excellent job in the management of the obx and esp. in consideration of the past few who held the job. They and the previous staff members often did a terrible job in management. I believe that turtle nesting areas should and must be better managed. Eggs should be moved to better areas so they have a chance to survive. Many turtle lay eggs in areas that have no chance of survival, but we just put flags around the eggs. There are other beach areas that do better jobs and even have turtle hospitals. Piping plover and other birds can be better protected for survival – by surround nets and overhead nets. There are more scientific measures that may help the birds to survive with orv or pedestrian traffic. I have had bird watchers with nps officials interfere with fishermen when the bird watchers had no knowledge of what they were talking about. We need professionals that have the knowledge of what they are doing. NPS research has been presented many times to the public. Yet the research has been validated by no other researchers and yet they expect us to take their research and believe it is gospel truth. Reliability and validity is an important aspect of all research – cannot have one study by NPS or wildlife management and use this as the final word. See this too many times. Handicap accessibility – needs improvement and more and better access. Repair dunes and roads that have been destroyed by storms. I have not seen the NPS repair any dunes. Along highway 12 it is always the state road crews doing the repairs. Case in point Hatteras Inlet beach – dunes there have not been repaired since the last series of hurricanes.

Nor has the road to Hatteras Inlet. I hear environmentalist write about the destruction from driving on the beach but years ago I read an article out of Australia where beach driving was shown to compact the beach and actually help prevent beach erosion in comparison to beaches that were never driven on. I also do not want to see a system as in New England where orv vehicles have to get a permit to drive on the beach. Of course there they have to do it in person. The Park can handle a specific number per day and thus you may be in line for eight hours and still not get a permit. You get to do it all over again the next day. Beach driving is crowded at times at the point but this is usually during holidays such as Memorial Day. Proper management should be able to permit beach driving and yet protect wildlife and people.

- Revision of closure rules is not viable option. MY wife and I and our two sons have been visiting the CHNS(RA) since 1984. We began with stays in the more established towns of Kitty Hawk, Kill Devil Hills, and Duck though they were not as developed as they are today. We quickly found our way south to Hatteras Island and saw people in the sand under the Bonner Bridge. Within three years we had a four wheel drive truck and began staying on Hatteras and Ocracoke. We have been driving on the beach for twenty years. We have stayed soundside to oceanfront, motel room to McMansion with family members who also love driving on the beach. Wherever we stay, for however long we stay, the cottage or room has been our base camp as we go on and off the beach at least three times per day. The reason we and many others come to CHNS(RA) is the access afforded by four wheel drive to so many miles of waves, birds, shells, and solitude. Miles of incredible beach is inaccessible any other way. One memorable Sunday dawn we found ourselves the only truck at Cape Point with a gigantic pile of conch shells thrown up by an off shore hurricane. People know the Outer Banks are like this and many own ORVs and pay to stay here or own and maintain property here for the right to beach access. The NPS guaranteed that access would not change when it took over management of the islands. To severely limit ORV use by over managing access with excessive and unneeded closures would in effect close the recreation area. Without seasonal visitors who come to surf, fish, and enjoy the many pleasures of the off road beach would also severely affect the economies of the villages on Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands. Parking and boardwalks are needed for pedestrian visitor use. The amount of parking, boardwalks, and paved road needed to maintain even a small fraction of the current level of access would be exorbitantly expensive to construct and an ecological nightmare. Tire tracks in the sand are much less permanent than asphalt. As far as the issues of inexperienced drivers and ramps that are soft or lead to soft sand (ramps 4, 38, and 49 among others), signs provided by NCBBA are accurate but frequently unread or ignored. Ramps should be reconfigured so signs can be read, drivers can pull over, and the recommendations followed. We want to be the first to apply for the rampside concession to sell pressure gauges.
- Since the 1970's many ramps both on Ocean and sound side have been eliminated and the need for added ramps. Also since the 1970's many of the roadside parking areas have been eliminated and the need is great in this area as well. Commercial fishermen were insured that they would have access to all beaches open to ORV's, seasonal closed and permanently closed have been open and must continue this practice. Only closures extended to the beach for endanger species should be restricted for commercial fishing use.
- The notion of breaking up the beaches into "passive recreation" areas is non-productive. The beaches are and should remain open to ALL users. There is plenty of beach available to those that wish to not be in the presence of ORVs. Besides, Pea Island NWR is available to hard-core ORV haters.
- I object to the term "Passive Recreation" being used to refer to all beaches except ORV beaches as almost all users of ORV's also engage in the activities described in your definition of "Passive Recreation" when on the beaches. Since all the beaches of the Seashore are recreation beaches I would suggest that the distinction between beaches be limited to "Lifeguard" or "Swim" beaches, "Multi-use" beaches and "ORV Multi-use" beaches which will fairly describe all beaches. Visitors may interpret passive recreation as limited to sunbathing and sitting in a chair only. Would all visitors get an instruction sheet giving them your definition of passive recreation? Multi-use is a widely understood term and passive recreation is not. Any workbooks that are submitted run the chance of containing misinformation as the maps presented with the original workbook were in error and misleading and thus any answers based on the original maps are useless. Only the online maps have been adjusted and not those in printed workbooks so corrections made online can not be assumed to have reached those who got printed versions. Even the maps online are still not accurate since some areas are not labeled correctly. You can not depend on any answer relating to the status quo or changes to ORV driving areas unless the map errors are pointed out by the respondent.
- ORV use is recreation, and it's some people's way of enjoying the beach, the weather and the beauty of the beach/nature. ORV use is also a means for sportsmen (and women) to carry all of their necessary equipment and

family to and from the distant beaches that are too far to carry on foot. Most ORV's do not destroy the beach with their use. Only a few ORV's abuse this privilege and give all good ORV's a bad name; responsible ORV use should be enforced with strong (published/posted) fines by the NPS, in regards to speeding, driving where not allowed, reckless driving, drunkenness, etc. I have lived on the Outer Banks for 2+ years now and have vacationed here since the late 1980's. There are truly more ORV's on the beach today than the 1980's, but the population has also grown and more can afford a 4X4, and more come to OBX every year just to enjoy driving on the beach and enjoy all that God has created here. I don't think we want to turn tourists away for any reason since they are this area's lifeblood in regards to revenue. It's their money that allows the locals to enjoy the lifestyle we have. ORV tourists particularly impact the towns and businesses below the Bonner bridge annual revenues. The one thing that I have noticed is that there is not sufficient signage and information in tourist books and newspapers regarding proper ORV rules and regulations, warnings about enforcement, as well as areas of the beach that have been designated as off limits for resource management (animal habitat) and what that means. "Significant fencing" that is not roped off with string does not put out a strong enough warning to tourists who are unfamiliar with their intent. Many times I have seen people and pets in enclosures where they should not have been, and their answer when told is "I didn't see a sign" or "I didn't know". The wildlife is more harmed by pedestrians, pets, and predators than ORV's so why are ORV's blamed for endangering wildlife. The beach/Park is here for all to SHARE, and to enjoy each in his own way. Regarding drainage at the Point campground, it has been since Isabel (2003?) that the salt water has not been allowed to go back to the ocean. This has killed a thriving freshwater swamp and is getting close to salting the wells in Buxton. Increasing Parking in and next to the villages for use by non-oceanfront renters and visitors and increases in parking lot size at lifeguarded beaches would be a plus to passive recreationers, but is not an alternative to ORV use. What God (Mother Nature) does: When a storm comes and overwashes the Point, sand is gained and is lost. It is the loss of beach I'm worried about. (The following numbers are for demonstration only). If the beach is 10,000 sq yds, the bird enclosure is 6,000 sq yds, an overwash storm takes away 3,000 sq yds, leaving 4,000 sq yds of fishing beach and also takes 3,000 sq yds of the bird enclosure. As it is now, the bird enclosure will be put back to 4,000 sq yds and the fishing beach will be gone. Since there is less beach to share, it should be split equitably between the birds and fishermen. Neither can have it all. The bird areas need to be addressed in several ways; size, and length of closure, both pre-nesting and nesting times and size. This will be very hard to do, but I would like to see it happen. Clearing the grasses and brush around the pond at the Point will allow birds to have additional feeding/nesting areas. Clearing the grasses and brush between the pond and ramp 45 will open up huge amounts of beach for nesting/resting. As it stands now this area is closed year round. Grasses & weeds are growing closer to the fence and the tide line squeezing the fishermen out. Something new HAS to be tried. NPS, USFW have demonstrated the present course doesn't work well. increasing ORV access doesn't cost any money to promote. It will promote itself. NPS will be congratulated.

- Consider having a 10 or 15 mph speed limit after dark or after sunset.
- If there have to be area with limited access, consider ncbba, and obpa usage. the ones that are trying to preserve, protect, and enjoy.
- I never heard the term "passive recreation" until I started attending Reg/Neg workshops & reading this workbook. There are ample areas already for those without vehicular access without setting aside more & restricting ORV access. The park needs to be managed for "multiple uses & users" not any one group or use. We need to provide access for the disabled & those in their "golden years". ORV access is a must, not a luxury.
- I know you have this same story many times. My apology. I don't believe that orv's need to be restricted from using the beaches, what I do believe is that people who are not respecting the beaches and not respecting the beach goers are the people who are enjoying the most beautiful beaches in America. I have raised my children to not only to respect and cherish this resource but all natural resources. I feel that all of this that has happened in the past year is not making any sense, why punish lay abiding people and their families because a few irresponsible idiots can't control themselves. I would be lying if I told you I had never been inebriated on the beach, or for that matter I can't remember the last time I was on the beach with a fishing rod in one hand and a cold beer in the other. What separates me from some people is that I am responsible and respectful of what I have, I only drive where I should and don't drive at all if I have been drinking. The people who have caused all of this turmoil should be banned from these beaches forever, and when they don't have hatteras, and the outer banks at their disposal maybe they will finally understand what makes the outerbanks so special.

- It is important the park service remember that CHNS is a recreation area. Pea Island is a refuge and should be restricted but the rest of the national seashore should accommodate more not less human traffic. In many cases this means orv access.
- Taxi services are more problems than they solve. In that they go up and down the beaches constantly. I will stay at one spot for an hour or longer before I move my vehicle. They on the other hand are always moving and have to keep a schedule and are prone to speed.
- Write the plan according to what has presently been done. Don't mess with a good thing. Without visitors to your island a lot of people will be unemployed, rental companies debunked, homeowners at a loss, restaurants closed permanently, and the list goes on and on. Making drastic changes to the current system spells disaster for everyone, especially the residents who call the outer banks home. Old adage..."If it aint broke, don't fix it." Change is not always for the best.
- Need to protect dunes and other area. Set and enforce certain areas so people, ORV's, and wildlife, can get to areas, set and enforce rules and laws (if speed limits permit) for classes so that users should know and can be held accountable for offences.
- Basically, the status quo ORV management has been good. Full closures seem to more closely monitored these days. From ramp 23-34, any system to improve access when we have full beach closures would be welcome and improve fuel efficiency. Anglers from the Burton/Avon area occasionally must drive to ramp 30 or 27 to such closures.
- I am glad to see that we are trying to work together to keep the beaches open to beach driving.
- If passive recreation users object to vehicular traffic on the Hatteras Island beaches, they can use beach at Pea Island where ORV's are prohibited. Any federal monies appropriated to improve beach access for pedestrians should be spent on Island for parking lots, walkways, ect. Obviously, any further loss of ORV accessible beaches will result in additional crowding on beaches which allow ORV's (Assuming a permit system limiting user capacity is not implemented also). In my opinion, any type of permit system should be the last option.
- Again, the park has done a great job with nesting birds and turtles. Nobody is out there running over nest. Decline of certain birds is usalayy from predators! The mass mailing from groups like the Audubon Society worry me. They don't know or care about Hatteras Island, they are just told to vote for no access.
- I am pleased that we are collaborating to determine how to manage ORV traffic rather than ban ORV traffic. It is important to be as consistent as possible as to create a uniform set of rules for all persons all the time
- We need to educate the ORV users on the correct way to share the beach areas
- Throughout this booklet, I have found items introduced into the formulation of an ORV plan that seem to fly in the face of a workable plan. The plan should be about ORV usage, not suggestions to build parking lots at ramps to encourage passive use and up the ante for user conflict. Keep passive users in the areas that are not used and / or cant be used by ORVs. Clogging ramps with walk-overs is an accident waiting to happen. Citing various organic and other flora and fauna issues clouds putting the plan together the park was establish as a recreation area in the 1930s when the land was given to the park. It cannot magically be changed into a wilderness area. It is a populated beach resort area that contains seven villages within its boundaries. Killing foxes and raccoons to promote plover is not letting nature take its course. It is manipulations of species. USFWL killed several hundred geese that didn't migrate to breed. Why not rid ourselves of plovers who don't migrate to breed (aren't they suppose to go north too?). Manage flora and fauna with common sense. We don't need hundreds of feet from nests of plovers, and other birds that are not endangered don't even need be given the same parameters. Increase law enforcement and issue citations, reduce speed limit, open more beach to accommodate ORV traffic, evaluate loss of revenue if ORV access were denied or radically altered, better signage, staging area to air down, port-o-johns, hardened ramp entrances, interdunal by passes around blocked or dangerous areas.
- One of our biggest attractions to our beaches is being able to drive on the beach. By restricting this privilage our beaches will soon be like any other beach (VA beach). I have talked to many people from out of our area and one of

most important reasons for them coming to our beaches is because they can drive on the beach and have all their beach stuff with them. Rules are a must but restricting access to the beach is not good for our community.

- Back in the 18'00's when this land was turned over to NPS (according in a book about Cape Hatteras Seashore, the beach was to remain open at all times for the residents of the island for recreation and fishing.
- This comment is for the maps of ranger districts. They are wrong. The closures are mismarked. The open areas are not all correct. These maps need to be redone to give an accurate picture to the public.
- I have found this survey to be quite instructional as I had no idea the breadth of the options. Thank you so much for the opportunity to express myself about this wonderful Federal Park Area. Please do not let this wonderful Seashore and the resultant experiences had by all..fishermen,bathers etc.. be changed into what is now Assateague Seashore,Md. & Va. And the Barrier Islands of Va. Restricted usage is confusing and costly to all.
- It is very important that ORV access be maintained on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation area. There have been many closures and restrictions over the years that have reduced the ORV accessible areas tremendously. Any additional closures will contribute to overcrowding on the remaining open beaches.
- More should be done to accommodate visitors especially through the addition of: rampps, parking, access, restrooms, and trash disposal. Additional interdunal roads are needed to get around closures closures. This is where congestion usually happens. Passive recreation areas should be for lifeguarded beaches only when lifeguards are present. Closures need to be explained especially in established ORV areas. Extend passive areas only if passage over is provided. Also the village beach front is not private property and should remain open as it presently is. Need to get visitors off of Highway 12, it really does create a safety issue in the summer.
- I am disappointed in the re-vegetation and fixing up of the area at the old Lighthouse site since the big move. How can a person in a wheel-chair view the beach or the historical "Old Lighthouse Site."
- ORV access to the beaches of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Park is critical to the economy of the OuterBanks. Any attempt to eliminate or restrict this access would be devastating.
- Cape Hatteras National Recreation Park was created to control and guarantee all types of recreational use of the area. The beaches change with almost every tide and certainly with every storm. Flexibility in the designation of ORV and pedestrian access is a must.
- I feel everyone should pay a fee upon entrance to the park and those fees should be spent only on improvements to the park. Most importantly, I feel that Congress had clear and special intentions when they named and created the park. Cape Hatteras Nation Seashore Recreational Area was established for the benefit of the people.
- Interdunal roads often go through seasonal wetlands – any new roads need to be designed so this does not happen. Existing roads should be closed when portions are wet to protect water quality and keep the drivers from making their own detours through wetlands.
- New parking areas on ocean or soundside should be made with an environmentally friendly surface (not asphalt). It is a given that these sites will end up eroding into the ocean – so lets not make another source of pollution.
- NPS should consult with coastal geologists as to where it best makes sense to place any new ocean/ soundside parking lots – the NPS should consider island dynamics before selecting sites.
- All ramps open at all times unless extenuating circumstances warrant. Too often the ramps are closed due to arbitraty concerns from the NPS. Cape Point Campground Ramp on south side is not shown on your maps, but access is shown. This access is closed by NPS when the campground is open or closed dur to campground closures. The campground used to be open Easter through Thanksgiving, but now it is open from Memorial Day through Labor Day. This effectively closes access from Buxton to Southside beaches.
- I do feel that ORV management is important to help maintain safety and the beauty of CHNS. However, I don't agree with limiting ORV access or usage due to "knee jerk" reactions. Closures for safety reasons, resource protection, and

seasonal closures are understandable. In the past some resource closures have been excessive and have appeared to be the result of “knee jerk” reactions or attempts to pacify a particularly vocal group. Most of the current limitations/restrictions/laws governing ORV use are very successful in protecting people and the environment. I do think having more personnel to help enforce the regulations would be beneficial, but not limiting or restricting ORV use. The businesses on CHNS rely on recreational fishing for their livelihood.

- North Carolina has instituted a Salt water fishing license which covers both state and federal lands. Delaware, Maryland and Virginia have a fee for ORV's. By starting a program in North Carolina the fees can be designated for ramp and beach management. . By starting a program in North Carolina the fees can be designated for ramp and beach management. The biggest draw to the outer banks is the ability to travel on the beach by vehicle and fish. For many years the reputation of the outer banks has been for the excellent fishing. Limiting or closing the beach access will have grave economic impact to the area.
- Please keep in mind that the ORV users of all types (fishermen, bird watchers, sun bathers, surfers, etc.) are major contributors to the Dare County economy. The plan needs to protect the endangered species in a reasonable way and allow the visitors the maximum use and enjoyment of the Park.
- No restriction to commercial fishing should be considered. Commercial fishermen respect the beach and its value. Products of USA are much preferred than the option of imported seafood. Keep the US citizen employed in his trade. The local commercial fisherman/businessman depends on the ocean and his skills to provide for himself and family. Denying access is unacceptable. Do not outsource the trade. Restriction would take away the income and cause more drain on the state's economy to help support an otherwise capable worker.
- Nothing was mentioned about ORV soundside access. The present soundside access open to ORV should be kept the same as is, to allow ORV access to the sound in areas are presently there.
- ORV use has been an historical part of the Cape Hatteras experience since before the existence of the National Seashore, it must be fairly treated both from historical relevance, and as one type of user. Certainly nature and pedestrian users must be protected but justifiably so should ORV users. In the search for answers I suggest contacting Island Beach State Park in New Jersey, which is a very mini version of CAHA. This park suffers from the same pressures that exist at CAHA and has a very high use rate for an extremely small use area. Their solution works for them but would not be desirable for here but they at least have done the work you are facing. In the long run, your answer may be designated and restricted use areas, a through back to the separate but equal philosophy from our past. ORV users are heavily criticized but as an ORV fisherman I also criticize the surfers, families with children and pets, and the ignorant visitors that infringe and negatively impact my fishing experience. We are all entitled to use the beach but our different venues require possibly different areas and rules.
- Historically, commercial fishing is a source of income. When fishing is good, perhaps closures could be pulled back for short periods of time to allow comm'l. fishing as long as it was monitored and did not pose a threat to the species.
- Having gone through this entire document several times, often revising my answers, I feel it is necessary to comment that this entire document seems to have been designed to discourage public response! Public comment periods were held in locations, and at times, that would greatly prohibit most interested parties from participating. I've also heard from some folks that they found this document too cumbersome to work with and simply decided to not respond. Others have told me that the Park Service will do what it wants, irrespective of what anyone else thinks. (Personally, I'm inclined to think this too, but decided to respond anyway, in hopes I'm wrong!)
- Dare County understands the need to balance resource protection issues with public access and resource use issues. Dare County believes that a flexible approach should be used as blanket closures or seasonal closures may well protect the resource, but they do balance public use and access. Closures should only occur when a protected species has been observed in a given area and then the closure should be the minimum area and duration necessary to protect the observed species. Closure should not occur to create new habitat in hopes that protected species may come to the area and closures should not occur until a protected species has been observed immediately before the closure. When closed the, the closure area should be prominently marked and strictly enforced

- New Alternative...1.A.3 An alternative that considers opening all historic previously used ramps and interdunal roads should be developed. In all situations where these historic points of access are not considered, a firm reason for the closure should be explained, documented and the public should be allowed comment through this NEPA process. In addition, any alternative that restricts historic access points should provide for public consideration, some sort of "mitigation" in order to retain public use. Management tools that would meet this "mitigation criteria" could include expanded parking areas, automatic sunset provisions if the reason for closure are dynamic, or expansion of access in other areas in the Park.
- Good ORV management, like good highway traffic management, requires the consistent application and enforcement of basic controls. The continuing addition of new rules without education and available enforcement only invites infractions either thru lack of knowledge or indifference. Application and enforcement must be consistent throughout the park and not given to special areas, special villages, special individuals or groups. The only recognized passive areas should be for life guarded swimming beaches (during season) & villages (May 15-Sept 15). Other temporary closures are recognized for safety & resource protection. Set aside areas for single minded pursuits only confuse and enrage visitors regardless of their single-mindedness. Family groups would be forced to split up in order for each to enjoy his/her personal sport/endeavor. Interdunal roads and improved access ramps will make access easier, less congested, safer and simplify management that currently requires frequent visits, decisions concerning routing and labor to relocate signage, etc. Permanent, clear signage can be put into place, understood and maintained.
- I have been coming to Cape Hatteras since the summer of 1987 when I was 17 years old. In that time I have seen the number of visitors to the seashore explode. However, there are still miles of open beaches to explore and the seashore still has an honest, relaxing feel that the beaches of Delaware, NJ, and the Northeast have long since lost. I am gravely concerned that outside environmental extremists do not understand the motives behind the recreational seashore and do not understand that fisherman and ORV uses are also ethical concerned citizens when it comes to resource steward- ship. It is also important to remember that the NPS has limited resources for enforcement and infrastructure improvement. This is a shame on the current political administration. I respect the mission of the NPS. It is my firm belief that Cape Hatteras remain a recreational seashore with free and open beach access. It is possibly the most important surf fishing destination in the world and it would be a disgrace to have it managed by lock and key. It is personally offensive to my beliefs as an American citizen that environmental extremists want to negate my rights to enjoy the environment in sustainable ways.
- For reader information: I have been visiting Hatteras Island for 35 years. I typically stay in the Salvo, Waves area. However, when on the Island I visits all parts of the Park, including Ocracoke Island. I typically stay on the island in the spring and fall for a combined overnight stay that averages 35 nights per year. Summer visits by my family to the Park are rare but do happen. Regarding seasonal closures. The rents decrease dramatically for all rental cottages from labor day through memorial day. The reason for this--A significant decrease in demand for the rental cottages. If the demand for rental cottages is down significantly, then the use of the beach in front of villages is down significantly. This is strong evidence that current seasonal closure dates are adequate for safety reasons. The use of the beach (for passive use) goes down dramatically after Labor Day and does not return until after Memorial Day. I think the Park Service should have the option to close a beach in front of the Village based on weather events or other events. In other words, the Park Service should have the flexibility to extend a season if there is indication to do so. But, this should be due to extraordinary circumstances, not just a nice weather day in November for example. Once established in the ORV plan, seasonal closure dates should be fixed with little to no exception. Safety intervention by Park Service should always be possible. Guidelines should be established to help the NPS determine certain safety criteria that would require closure. With the exception of seasonal closures, I think ORV's and non-orv users can be on the same beach and be compatible. It is rare that I see a ORV user violate the space or endanger the safety of the public (passive) using the beach. We should not lose our rights because of the actions of a few. The beaches are owned by all of us. Year round closure of beaches simply because the homeowners do not want ORVs in front of their houses is not acceptable. The beaches of the Park are public beaches, not private beaches. The ORV plan should support this truth. The plan should provide for a system in which major changes can be implemented over time. For example, if an additional parking lot is deemed necessary, or additional ramp is deemed necessary, the public or the Park should have a process by which this can be requested and in time granted or denied. In this way, all stakeholders will have some input in the ORV plan as uses for the Park grows and needs change. In respect to "passive recreation areas." I do not believe the Park can minimize conflict among users if passive recreation areas are in place. I think they will cause increasing conflicts between ORV users and passive users--this conflict, for the most part, does not exist now. It has been my experience that ORV users and passive users can occupy the same beach and not interfere with the other. However, if a plan were put into place whereby beaches were closed to ORV use entirely, at all times of the

year, then I believe conflict would develop over time. How can it ever be fair that beaches designated for ORV use can also be used by anyone else at any time but beaches set aside for only passive activity can not be used by ORVs? In other words, to be fair, if the Park had passive recreation areas, would the Park not be required to also have ORV areas only (Meaning, no pedestrians, etc, no passive use, just ORV users)? Passive recreation areas leads to more and more conflict between all user groups and less and less freedom by the ORV users. I fully understand the need for seasonal closings in front of villages. This is for safety and makes perfect sense due to numbers of people on the beach during the summer season. But, to close beaches year around to ORVs so that non ORV users can have access denies the ORV user the right to use beaches that will in fact be practically empty or completely empty. Year round passive recreation areas are just not a good idea.

## 2. Education and Outreach

### 2.A. Education and Outreach on ORV Management and Related Resource Protection Issues

2.A.1 Provide information about endangered species at the visitor centers. (*status quo*)

#### Definitely Effective

- Yes, and at any other visitor contact places, including motels, hotels, bait shops, beach-wear stores, etc. Do present resources exist to do this? If not, what added money or other resources are needed? If this is being done now, is it effective? If not, why not? (THIS COMMENT ALSO APPLIES TO 2.A.2, 2.A.3 and 2.A.4)
- This type of outreach should be enhanced during resource closures. Especially helpful would be actual photographs of piping plovers as to distinguish between regular plovers.
- Those who are new to CHNSRA or who are interested will get the stop at the visitor centers
- NPS should create internships and programs that embrace the unique flora/fauna and cultural history of the Seashore. All divisions of the Park (Protection, Resource, Interpretation and maintenance) should be involved in presenting these programs to the Park. The fee collector at the kiosk or the maintenance worker cleaning the parking lots need to feel ownership/responsibility of the resource so that visitors will see flora/fauna resources of CHNS are assets not problems.
- One if the best NPS Visitor Centers ever visited had displays and information on all the wildlife and vegetation of the Smokies. We have a long way to go to match the Sugarlands VC, but we should try.
- Should also include the number of birds per season, number of deaths, number of survivors. Valid data.
- Make them audio visual.

#### May Be Effective

- This can sometimes cause an over reaction by the public and media
- Information flow to the occasional user of the park should be improved (comment repeated for 2.A.2-2.A.4)
- 2.A.1 Add Dare County, Visitors Bureau facilities and include ORV use information.
- For those who do stop at visit visitor centers. The majority of repeat visitors do not go to the visitors centers

#### Not Effective

- Not sole answer, but increased info cannot but help; need to spread info far beyond just VC.
- Provide information about our natural resource as a whole not only one area as this offers a bunch of different areas to teach and learn about our seashore

**2.A.2** Provide educational and outreach materials regarding the impacts of trash disposal, wildlife feeding, fireworks, and pets on sensitive resources at the Seashore. (*status quo*)

**Definitely Effective**

- Definitely worth the effort and cost; how and how much materials yet to be developed.
- Enforcing littering fines should help this.
- Listing the fines for some of the infractions
- Valid education and not directed at any specific group to help prove another groups point. We are all in this together.

**Not Effective**

- Educational outreach materials need to be included in the glass enclosed signage at ramps. Also, NPS should put together a brief cheat sheet and ask rentals to post the sheet. This is where most people look.
- A few signs regarding the issue at the lighthouse and possibly a seminar added to the Jr. Ranger program would be sufficient. Developing, printing and distributing more and more materials would not be cost effective and would end up in one of the few waste receptacles provided by the park. Another waste of money.

**2.A.3** Notify the public of species management closures that temporarily limit ORV traffic, which would include sending a press release to local and regional newspapers and contacting local tackle shops and ORV organizations when species closures are established or reopened. (*status quo*)

**Definitely Effective**

- Create a website with this information and publicize it so people can check before they leave home. I think this would be the most effective method.
- current email system works well
- Maybe an alert service could be created to notify interested parties via portable devices.
- Keep the frustration level low on closures before unnecessary resources have been spent to go to an area
- Please do not go past reasonable time lengths on closures like 2007 (turtle nest at ramp 44) that had been flooded many times by storms and was not viable. It should have been dug up after the first flooding and the eggs saved & not lost to nature.
- I would recommend circulation thru local real estate rental agencies and hotels/motels also.
- As long as we are using the best management techniques to help those endangered species to survive and not based on a couple of individuals ideas.
- Always add the "why" need for the action; call "limitations" not "closures" unless people can't even easily see into an area.
- As well as posting local tv channels that outline the usage of ORVs on the beach, such as Outerbanks Angler
- Many visitors to the park are not local and do not read local newspapers, belong to ORV organizations, or visit tackle shops. Other publicity outlets should be identified.

**May Be Effective**

- difficult for people here on short visits

- Not sure people pay attention.

### **Not Effective**

- Based on info available, increased effort does not appear to be working.
- Not as effective as it would seem. The Seashore is so linear, and with the time it takes to speak to individual in a District, and with many Districts to cover, mass notifications are the most efficient. While we need to address our partners, it shouldn't be a burden to do so. The goal here should be to provide the locals and visiting public with what is or is not available of any or all usage.

**2.A.4** Provide information to local shops, the Seashore website, and the local cable TV channel.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Local cable channels showing temporary closures and alternate access around any such temporary closures would be effective.
- Seek grants and other funds to promote positive public relations about the flora/fauna of the Park
- Why not explore the use of the local public TV or Gov access channels.
- The Seashore website is not very user friendly and most folks use their time here to get away from the job, e-mails, bills etc

### **May Be Effective**

- Will cost be an issue for local cable?

**2.A.5** Hire more park rangers to provide additional informal education/stewardship.

### **Definitely Effective**

- More rangers are needed for many purposes.
- As a fisherman, many times I've wished that a ranger was close by to stop the improper driving or free roaming pets by those who are not fishing. More rangers would help.
- Boots on the ground will help – not just info, but enforcement.
- Ranger presence increases compliance of rules & regulations, without the need for as many enforcement rangers.
- Rangers that are friendly to the public and educate them on all of the closures, and the usage of ORVs in the park.

### **May Be Effective**

- The NPS would have to have more resources made available to implement this type of program
- and fisheries enforcement
- Maybe not hiring park rangers but enlisting the use park volunteers.
- Best interface may be by talking to people on the beach

- We had the point closed during the summer for 3 piping plovers. Not enough money for anything else but all of a sudden the NPS had more than enough money to hire numerous guards to block off the beach at check point Charlie. Hire for good management purposes. Hiring or having local groups help remove trash debris, repair dunes is better than more rangers just patrolling the grounds. Although I have called NPS about violations and they never responded.
- Only more enforcement officers that can provide effective dialog during any needed closures and to patrol and enforce rules of the seashore when closures are not needed which should be most of the time except during nesting seasons.
- Use the Resource Management Summer Hires for this.

### **Not Effective**

- If the information is provided thru the website and other media that should be sufficient.
- This is a luxury that cannot be justified based upon the current shortage of law enforcement rangers and other park personnel. Law enforcement rangers should get out of their vehicles occasionally and circulate among visitors. During such walks law enforcement rangers will inevitably be engaged in conversation and can use the opportunity to provide informal education.
- I do not feel this is a job for Park Rangers. This could be accomplished by developing programs with user group organizations at little cost and or developing internship programs with local high school or college students. Training programs for these interns could be conducted by both local user group organizations and NPS staff in order to keep costs low and maximize user group "ownership" or "stewardship" of the park.

**2.A.6** Expand the "Know Your Park" speaker series to include programs on ORV management and related resource protection issues.

### **Definitely Effective**

- It sounds as if this option is part of the status quo. Is it? If knowing your park doesn't include "ORV management and related resources protection issues," what does it include?
- Have Audio-Visual (AV) in all of them.
- Yes – but invited speakers should not be verbally attacked.

### **May Be Effective**

- The NPS would have to have more resources made available to implement this type of program
- effectiveness depends on whether ORV users attend
- Most of the people who would be attending these series are already sensitive to resource protection issues.
- As long as this isn't used as a political tool to try to convince non-ORV users that ORV's should be limited.
- difficult to get fishermen to attend during season
- Ask different groups, "What would like to hear about?"
- Including ORV management and resource protection in "Know your Park" could be effective if it does not detract from basic services such as maintenance and enforcement.
- These have been poorly attended and only in winter when few visitors are here. Done in the summer may be of value

### **Not Effective**

- The only people that want to know ORV management and resource issues are people that access the beach with ORV's. When they are on their vacation more than likely they'll be using their ORV to go to the beach rather than going to listen to a speaker talk about it. Another waste of money.
- Waste of money since most want to access the beach to reach a point on the beach for the recreation they enjoy. They will not attend speakers preaching ORV management and resource protection.

**2.A.7** Improve signage in the Seashore so beach closures and Seashore resource information is readily available and presented in a clear manner to the public.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Make the ramp numbers consistent with the Highway 12 mile markers.
- Signs don't need to be hired or paid wages.
- Just find a way for the signs to survive the storms. These are unimproved highways, can DOT provide signs?
- Limit use of the term "closure" unless there is no even the ability to see inot an area.
- While not 100% effective this is still the best bang for the buck, however, more creative signs are needed, eg. Possibly similar to fire hazard condition signs; eye catching colors, large easy to see charts, maybe even solar powered lighting etc

### **May Be Effective**

- The NPS would have to have more resources made available to implement this type of program
- On a limited need only basis. The signs need to blend in a be low profile.
- low impact, eco-friendly
- This year's improvements in signage were effective. Adding a pedestrian with a line to the ORV with the line would help. Beyond this care must be taken not to detract from the asthetics of the beach.
- I am concerned that the increased signage referred to here and elsewhere would detract from the charm and ambiance of the seashore and it would become more like a Myrtle Beach or a Coney Island

### **Not Effective**

- Closures are already identified and are self explanatory. Increasing signage will just require more tax money to be wasted.

**2.A.8** Partner with other federal, state and local government agencies to develop and distribute joint information about ORV use and protection of beach resources.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Needs a moderator that can mediate and be neutral
- Offer AV programs to all and put routinely on local TV.

### **May Be Effective**

- At least on the State and Local levels this information and decisions should be made available.
- Information needs to be specific and applicable to OBX.
- I don't see this as practical, since NPS does not typically have the manpower to implement these partnerships
- Effectiveness would depend on the willingness of other agencies to participate and the outlets used to disseminate the information.
- This would depend entirely on the slant of the information. If it was authored by the likes of Ted Williams of the Audubon Society on one side or by one of the extreme members of the other persuasion not effective. If by Irene Nolan or another objective reporter then O.K. definitely effective

#### **Not Effective**

- The resources in North Carolina with regard to the barrier islands, and the uses of ORV's in these areas, are unique, and should not be co-mingled with other ORV areas nationwide, or statewide.
- Be careful with this, the camel's nose under the tent, is as good as in the tent.
- Why? The beach is either open or it's not. You can drive on the beach or you can't. Why add more layers of government on top of this situation. How many years would it take for NPS and local government to agree on what form of publication to use?

## **2.B. Education and Outreach for Local Interest Groups and Other Interested Citizens**

### **2.B.1 Solicit from interested parties how to convey information about the species management program. (*status quo*)**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Keep emotions out of the outcomes and stick to the facts around the research data.
- NPS should use every opportunity to be positive and proactive about the need and mandate for resource management.
- Public input especially from representatives of user group and interested organizations is always a good idea. the park should have both an ORV and a Natural Resource subcommittee reports to an overall CAHA citizen advisory committee that in turn recommends actions to the park. My central point is that I support this alternative in such a way as I would like to see a formal method of informed public advice or comment be built into the plan.

#### **May be Effective**

- If the alternative recreation usage around these delicate areas is also addressed, the program could be very effective.

#### **Not Effective**

- This is not effective because decisions made within the park are inundated with miss information from extremists from either side

### **2.B.2 Work with local organizations and businesses to ensure wider distribution of ORV and resource protection information.**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- As long as selections are balanced (i.e.: having DOW and Audubon with only 1 local business would be unbalanced)

- Include other users group organizations, ie, NCBBA, CHAC, OBPA
- This is only effective when interested parties have a direct connection to the locality. Resource users comments should carry more weight than environmental activists who have never visited the OBX.
- In insert into the welcome packets for renters would be a good idea
- The key word is “local”.
- Partner resource related workshops with local organizations about what the Park is doing and how local organizations and their members can complement the Park’s mission and mandate.

### **May Be Effective**

- difficult for businesses to do
- Local organizations and businesses already distribute such information--see for example links to CHNSRA web site and the Fish Malitia video, "Outer Banks Beach Basics". Based upon this observation additional opportunities are limited. In no case should resources required for basic services such as maintenance and enforcement be diverted to this activity.
- Needs more than just this. Need to get on cable TV, in rental houses, campgrounds and motel rooms as well as retail shops.
- Also have TVs and CDs to display the local TV shows on the “how to’s” of ORV and pedestrian usage. If permitting is implemented the information should be shown at tackle shops as well as surfshops as well as all local shops that deal in beach recreation.

### **Not Effective**

- The phrase, "if an orv permitting system is developed" has no place in this question. I feel like you are trying to push this concept into acceptance and feel offended because it detracts from my ability to address the rest of the issue. Therefore, you don't allow people to answer the question in an unbiased way. This question and all others like it that speak of the issue of permitting should not be counted - unless they are placed in a specific section that deals with permitting.

**2.B.3** Encourage the Visitors Bureau and local tackle shops to link their websites to the Seashore’s website to ensure different segments of the visiting public have up-to-date information on beach closures and, if an ORV permitting system is developed, ORV permitting information.

### **Definitely Effective**

- As long as base task of reducing closers it met as first order, then communications should be addressed
- Sounds like a good idea. Include also hotels, motels, beach outlets, restaurants, etc
- Include the many real estate management (house rental companies) in this program
- There is very little up-front cost, for long term pay-offs.

### **May Be Effective**

- I am not in favor of a permitting system. I have seen the problems that has caused in other areas.
- Yes, the internet could/would reach many more people than any local endeavor...and it is cost efficient.

- Would be difficult to keep all sites in sync
- If the NPS has the manpower and resources to implement the program. Permits are not required at the CHNRS and any discussion is part of REG-NEG,

#### **Not Effective**

- How about if the visitors want to know something, they look up the information themselves. ORV permitting information will not be necessary because there will not be a permit system. A permit system would destroy the economy of the park and the seven villages. It's interesting how you guys slipped that in there though. Nice try.
- Issues can arrive when sites are linked. The legalities of who is responsible for content are important.

#### **2.B.4 Work with ORV groups to develop and implement an ORV operator training program.**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- OBPA and NCBBA, I am a member of both and I am sure that they would be more than happy to oblige.
- Those of us who are members of the groups are there for a reason and that is to work with the NPS to assure a future of ORV usage for our children
- To be conducted by whom? How might it be paid for? Will it be linked as a requirement to a possible permit program? Fees?
- Every web site bulletin board I visit always has questions about driving on the beach. Whether it is type of vehicle or air pressure; a training program or video would be great.
- ORV groups already provide guidelines for ORV use--see NCBBA signage provided at each access ramp. Also see the Fish Malitia video, "Outer Banks Beach Basics".
- Don't limit this to ORV groups, include fishing clubs and conservation groups such as the Coastal Conservation Association (CCA).
- Sounds like a good idea as long as it is not cumbersome and esp. for those who have driven n the beach for years. Do believe vacationers need some kind of education of what they need or how to drive
- These programs are now in use in all NCBBA and CHAC now. They along with OBPA and Outer Banks Adventures has produced a video that covers proper use of ORV's on the beach as well as other great passive visitor training on protecting the parks resources.

#### **May Be Effective**

- It 's not that difficult if people just know the basics.
- For many people only at the beach for a week or weekend taking the time to attend a training program will not happen.
- Enforcement and high fines are the best defense
- People that join these groups are already aware.
- Should be followed up with a way to monitor how people drive .... i.e. citations to those to ignore the rules and violate the trust.
- This could be a good idea, but should not be a mandatory requirement for beach driving. Most of us have been driving these beaches for years and know how to operate safely.

- Not all ORV users belong to an ORV group.
- This looks almost to be too big a job. A lot of people only drive the beach when at the Park and many for the first time.
- As many ORV users are out of state this may be difficult
- Effective only if ORV groups do not undermine the purpose of the management plan.
- ORV groups could volunteer trained members to administer test and teach ORV workshops.
- Most members of NCBBA, OBPA and CHAC do not need the training and CHAC is only one that has a facility to host such a program. Would have to be done on the beach and well advertised. This kind of a program might be mandatory for a violator to attend before being allowed back in Seashore.
- 98% know proper ORV operation. The others do not ask questions and probably would not seek training. \$150- for getting pulled out of the sand is a real education.
- By permitting for a fee access to the beach, a simple short review could be done of proper driving habits on the beach

#### **Not Effective**

- Most people do not visit long enough to take advantage of such programs. Locals and those who are repeat visitors already know this.
- Permitting is not required. The only persons causing problems are the irresponsible ones and permitting does nothing to them.
- this is very similar to boaters education for everyone
- I would rather see "Guidelines" for distribution to users. Requiring a training program as a condition of use, that will be a poor use of everyone's time
- Not effective if mandatory; effective if optional
- Do not feel training is necessary
- Air down and drive slowly. There's your training. Another waste of time and money. We're not dumb and we don't need the government to think for us.
- Inadequately trained operators aren't the problem. Step up enforcement against willful abusers
- Most ORV groups have information and training in place already

**2.B.5** Develop a user-friendly ORV educational program (e.g., video, DVD, or on-line) that could be self-administered at a variety of outlets such as tackle shops, welcome centers, and NPS offices.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Not only should the DVD be displayed in just local tackle shops, but in all shops dealing with beach recreation.
- Especially on line
- Who pays for its development? Should be NPS so that it is not biased in favor of increased ORV uses

- There already is one on beach driving on the Fishing Militia web site.
- I teach a salt water fishing class and this is a part of the class. A power point program that includes rules and regulations of how to honor the beach, drive on the beach etc.

### **May Be Effective**

- If it is on-line, why can't people do it from home?
- Not effective if mandatory; effective if optional
- This way people could choose to watch or not
- A video already exists and has been aired on cable TV. Furthermore, nearly all local businesses are already linked to the NPS website. As for businesses providing access to such videos, time and space considerations probably preclude this option. NPS offices, however, could easily make videos and on-line media available. Rentals may be willing to place videos by their TVs. In no case should resources required for basic services such as maintenance and enforcement be diverted to this activity.
- Again, too big a task.
- May be effective as such program exists in NJ at Island Beach Park (Video) A Youtube tape might even work

### **Not Effective**

- How do you expect for businesses to provide space for an undetermined number of ORV users? Can welcome centers and Park offices handle these folks?
- Don't waste more money. Rob Alderman is already doing or has done a video about ORV driving and it airs or will air on local channel 12 several times a day during season. What is the size of the parks budget anyway?

**2.B.6** Encourage ORV groups to provide beach driving information at key access ramps (e.g., Ramp 4) to help novice drivers.

### **Definitely Effective**

- or NPS could provide
- Every time I go to Hatteras I end up helping or pulling out someone. Almost all ways it someone new to the beach.
- I can't speak for NCBBA but this sounds like something they would love to sponsor.
- And provide ORV educational material on their websites.
- ORV groups already provide guidelines for ORV use--see NCBBA signage provided at each access ramp. Also see the Fish Militia video, "Outer Banks Beach Basics".
- Local tackle shops as well – many online fishing web sites would be more than happy to promote these programs.
- Doesn't NCBBA have signs already?

### **May Be Effective**

- This depends on volunteer resources. Could be unreliable

- Burden should be shared with NPS.
- Probably better if NPS did it
- They should also provide maps with alternative routes for ORVs and pedestrians when closures are implemented.
- I think better signage would best tackle this issue
- Expense is an issue with all these ideas, good ideas, but where will the funding come from?

#### **Not Effective**

- This is not their responsibility. It should be done by the Park Service.
- Might work for a while, but its staying power is likely limited, above all if the ORV groups are asked to do it without monetary compensation
- The current signage covers this already. It is simply a maturity issue
- ORV groups likely would undermine the management plan.
- Novice drivers that have passed a written test should drive with licensed ORV drivers.
- Required training would be even better. Could there be an ORV enforcement on the drivers license like there is for motorcycles?
- Road signs are there now.

### **2.C. Resource Oriented Education and Outreach Programs Relevant to ORV Management and Protection of Beach Resources**

**2.C.1** Conduct educational programs during the sea turtle hatching season where public school students could learn about sea turtles by participating in post-hatching nest examinations. (*status quo*)

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Is already done by the NPS on site.
- This educates the youth and will make them more conscious for the future of the beaches.
- Programs should be available to adults also. Beside public school programs it should be offered to community college and 4 year college students.
- What took so long – should have been during this long ago. Check out Topsail beach programs – where has the NPS been. Topsail beach even has a turtle hospital.
- I believe providing natural resource education is a part of the NPS purpose. I also think adults would be interested in a program as described. I do not understand why this is in an ORV planning document and suggest ORV revenue should not pay for this.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Presumed valuable and minimum expectation in general terms, but questionable value in ORV management in the short run.

- Should be left up to the teachers and schools
- This could also payback by training NPS personnel about non-viable overwashed nests.
- have the turtles hatch in a safe area and when hatched release in the ocean
- Sea turtles need to be moved after hatching, not only to improve hatch-rate (which has been proven in other parks, as well as here before the implementation of “natural hatching” was foolheartedly developed.

**2.C.2** Provide information to the public about nesting sea turtles and measures taken by the Seashore to protect nests and hatchlings. (*status quo*)

**Definitely Effective**

- Combine with how the public can contribute to protection of the nesting sea turtles
- For the most part, visitors appear to be aware of sea turtle issues.
- Important and necessary but hard to disseminate the information. Suggest having rental agencies include a flyer in their contract mailings as well as have information in the rental house

**May Be Effective**

- Minimal expectation, but questionable value in short term management of endangered species
- Should still provide some type of "pass through" access around the protected area
- Nests that uninformed turtles place in areas of overwash should be incubated and not lost to nature.
- As long as the NPS also shows the “shortcomings” of natural hatching. Also, it should be explained to the public the “whys” on natural hatching vs. removal to a safer location due to the changing environment on Hatteras Island.

**Not Effective**

- We don’t need anything provided to us when we can see right in front of our eyes that there is a turtle closure right in front of us that we have to go around. More money wasted.

**2.C.3** Post information about seabeach amaranth at all ORV ramp bulletin boards. (*status quo*)

**Definitely Effective**

- Need to improve this, I don’t know what a seabeach amaranth it!!! I Googled it and it looks like seaweed.
- Post information more prominently at ramps

**May Be Effective**

- Minimal expectation, but necessary effort; if existing, not readily visible to ORV drivers..
- Such information ought to be included at all public contact points on and off the park, not just at ORV ramp contact points
- An actual picture of the plant needs to be displayed in the explanation, as well as do’s and don’ts when encountering this plant.

### **Not Effective**

- This is not status quo. There was no seabeach amaranth observed in 2007 and only limited observance in prior year. Ineffective.
- Would most likely be a wasted effort. Most people do not seriously care about “plants” especially when on vacation. Info on a bulletin board is probably the best approach even though a weak one

**2.C.4** Provide roving interpreters at key beach driving locations to provide information on beach driving rules and beach resource protection.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Without penalty to anyone. Education only.
- Of course, but where will the money and staff come from? This ought to also be done by law enforcement Rangers as part of their job.
- Dress the interpreters in NPS uniforms, otherwise they will not be taken seriously. Give them radios to call enforcement.
- Coupled with the maps to provide alternate routes throughout the park that deal properly with the resource as well as the full recreational possibilities created by alternative routes around the closures.
- They have this on ski mountains and it is effective. People look to these people for info and it keeps visitors acting properly.

### **May Be Effective**

- With the park service already strained for rangers this could present a problem with staffing.
- At high use times only
- If there is a way to passively conduct this activity so interpreters do not interrupt resource users.
- This would only be effective economically during high volume times.
- Having someone at the ramps is one idea. But, having someone out on the beach interacting while visitors are relaxing, bird watching, picnicking, fishing or whatever may not be well received.
- Depends on volunteers, therefore unreliable.
- Make this part of the enforcement program
- Interpreters could be placed at key resource areas to provide educational information and programs about resource protection especially when resource closures are being constructed or expanded. Drivers should know driving rules, explaining rules on the beach is too late.
- Believe me all the fisherman I know do this in a heart beat. WE would be as fisherman more than willing to help here.
- This should not be done by Park Rangers. I support the use of user group organizations, high school and college student interns and other low cost ways to administer this program.

### **Not Effective**

- Very limited resource. May be some limited impact at high volume village areas. But roving is not warranted.

- Posting signs and hold ORV users responsible for their actions
- This is a luxury that cannot be justified based upon the current shortage of law enforcement rangers and other park personnel. Law enforcement rangers should get out of their vehicles occasionally and circulate among visitors. During such walks law enforcement rangers will inevitably be engaged in conversation and can use the opportunity to provide informal education.
- How many people would need to be hired to say “Air down and drive slowly”? Again, we are licensed drivers and are not dumb. If we get stuck we dig ourselves out or call Jarvis.
- Very costly. Will people really want to stop or just hit the beach.
- A small local population and monetary constraints make such a program unlikely to succeed.
- Recommend the ORV groups to have volunteers mark their orv's as "helpers"
- Getting volunteers and funding would be an issue. Additionally, many users would resent being approached and being “instructed”. Could lead to confrontation.

**2.C.5** Establish an “adopt a beach” program with local schools or community groups.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Conduct a "beach sweep" and get all ORV groups, surfing groups, outdoor groups, and so on to participate together on the same day to build relat.
- Include local and national sportsman groups
- A sense of ownership is a good idea
- Works for road side cleanup on highways.
- Educating the public that much of the litter that is on the beach comes from tankers and other ships at sea that wash up on the beach. That is also our responsibility to clean up as well as litter that is made by beach goers, including birdwatchers.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Could do a trash pickup project similar to what is done along highways.
- Good idea. The experience of highway departments who do this for road segments might be good to know. Does the commitment last? Does it require supervision by NPS staff? It will need to include a clear statement of responsibilities and expectations.
- Why not, but would have to be related to many other related and interlocking management efforts.
- Depends on volunteers, therefore unreliable.

#### **Not Effective**

- When I travel to the ORV areas along the beaches of North Carolina, I am a consistent “adopt a beach” program, and collect any trash I encounter. Nearly every other ORV user that uses the resource to access fishing locations, I am aware of has the same attitude. Trash is encountered more consistently due to pedestrian users and ATV users that are not using ORV’s to access fishing locations in my experience.
- May be Effective in the short term but not long term. Limited resource, becomes fad de-jour

- The local population is small and the beach area is large.
- We already have adopt a highway and multiple beach clean up days. Given the current beach clean ups sponsored by various anglers' clubs and the willingness of various anglers's clubs and other local individuals to help in clean ups required after severe weather events, the incremental benefit of an adopt a beach program is questionable.

**2.C.6** Conduct community clean-ups at known breeding areas right before pre-nesting management begins (before the birds arrive). Partner with the Boy Scouts/Girl Scouts on projects (e.g., an eagle scout project for maintaining closures).

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Again solicit volunteers using avenues such as Surfrider, OBPA, NCBBA, and others.
- NCBBA already does this on their own. Have you every seen Audubon, Blue Water, Sierra Club, etc. doing this?
- Defenders of Wildlife, Bluewater Network, and Southern Environmental Law Center & Audubon NC should jump at this chance to benefit the Park.
- tHIS CAN BE SET UP ON A SCHEDULE ,WEATHER PERMING.SAME TIME EACH YEAR.EXAMPLE.SECOND WEEK-END OF MAY

#### **May Be Effective**

- I have often marveled at the lack of trash on Ocracokes beaches. Most of the trash i have observed has been washed in from the seas. Any help cleaning this up especially to ensure it is not washed back out to sea would be helpful
- Only effective if the NPS has the resource to provide administrative and oversight functions. This will definitely require an increase in NPS staffing levels and budget increases.
- Depends on volunteers, therefore unreliable.
- Manpower is the question. Many locals will not get involved in beach clean ups. Most beach clean ups, in the past have been done by ORV organizations and fishing clubs
- ORV groups perform beach cleanups on a regular basis. Involving Boy Scouts/Girl Scouts in terms of badge programs may be effective secondary to the number of scouts on the islands.
- The NPS should sponsor clean-ups throughout the year and encourage public participation. There are many families that would like to clean the beaches and the roadsides. The NPS could join the clean-ups and provide the participants with an educational program afterward that helps educate them about why cleaning the beaches is important and how their contributions made a difference.

#### **Not Effective**

- In my 30 years of visiting Hatteras, I have always found that the fishermen do an excellent job of cleaning up there own mess...and more.
- Communtiy clean ups (primarily NCBBA) are conducted around these times. As for Scouts or other such groups, there are not enough such groups on Island to assist in maintianing closures. The Cape Hatteras Anglers club did assist in this capacity in the past. This may, if the bird club and other environmental organizations can be convinced to drop the conflict of interest argument, be a source of manpower again.

- Why would the park service clean up for birds when they didn't clean up when the Styrofoam from the container ship that washed up last year or after the big storms. Last I checked the ORV users gathered with no government involvement and cleaned up their beach.
- This could disturb the nesting ground
- Shouldn't we have community beach clean-ups with in the entire seashore and several times a year? WHY should the nesting areas be the only part of the park that should be cleaned up? I find this insulting to all beach users! Perhaps a national group like Audubon can send someone to make the beach pretty for the birds!

**2.C.7** Involve local environmental groups, such as the Audubon Society, to lead bird-watching tours.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- How about using such groups to develop a data base so we have actual numbers of various species.
- This appears a key way to develop resource data base-line info.
- for birds or other wildlife animals. Kayak tours and other means of educ. Tours.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Depends on the individuals. This could be counterproductive, depending on the individuals.
- I answer this with caution, since the Audubon society has been so relentless in the banning of ORV usage on Hatteras Island
- Depends on volunteers, therefore unreliable.
- No brainwashing here, a balanced agenda only. They should not be allowed to say "if those ORVs over there where gone, these birds would be better off."
- If you use the Cape Hatteras Bird Club, not Audubon
- These environmental groups should also have maps to distribute with alternative routes around closures, along with educating the public as to what birds are there and threatened by pedestrian and ORV usage within the closure.
- Any group that is willing to conduct programs such as this should be encouraged to do so if the program is open to all visitors and does not require membership in said group. I also suggest these groups be allowed to give out and sell group memberships during these events. If any money beyond memberships is charged, then the group should be considered a vendor and fall under another set of regulations which includes paying a premium fee to do business in the park.

#### **Not Effective**

- Audubon Society is a radical group that is prone to exaggeration of truths and will likely mis lead the public about the true status of animals
- involve them in the pre-nesting clean-ups. I'm under the impression they do this now.
- If bird species are so protected, why should bird watchers be allowed to interfere?
- The beaches are open to public. All diverse groups would be further encouraged to organize private outings.
- Should be left as one on one with nature

- This group has not contributed to the resource in the past.
- Bird watching tours are part of the bird club's activities. If more bird watching tours or other similar activities are desirable, the private sector will provide the required activities. In fact, there is a sign in Avon for Eco Tours. Similarly, there is a Island tour bus that gives a historical/cultural tour of the Island. Quite simply, anything beyond the current programs for birding, fishing, etc. are not a function of the park service--unless, of course the idea is to give environmental groups access to areas not open to the general public which would, of course, be totally unacceptable.
- Why can't they set up their own tours? Why would the park service need to provide resources for one group and not another?
- These groups have shown extremism and only tours by NPS interpreters should be allowed. These interpreters must also be trained to give well-rounded tours not giving miss-information to the public. All tours should remain on well-marked paths to avoid destruction of nesting sites.
- Sounds good but only a handful of visitors go on bird tours at Cape Hatteras Lighthouse now and despite all of the promotion by NPS, USF&W, The Sentinal Newspaper and the Chamber of Commerce the average attendance at Wings Over Water in the last six years has been only 219 and they now have many non-birding tours included due to even lower attendance. Until the Cape Hatteras Bird Club got on the Neg. Reg. committee only a dozen or so members would consistently attend meetings. These figures speak volumes about the popularity of birding to visitors on the Outer Banks.
- Bird watching spooks the birds, keep people out of the closures.
- Organizations that threaten or bring suits against the NPS should not be given leadership roles. The NPS, as a neutral party or other government agencies, MUST be seen as leaders. The Audubon Society and other organizations like it should only serve in capacity as an assistant to the NPS and never be allowed to do anything without oversight of a NPS representative. These organizations will, when given the chance, exaggerate issues, make false statements and accusations and mislead the general public. Numerous printed examples exist concerning the issue of ORV use at the seashore.
- The environmental groups have shown their inability to work with other park users as evidence by their lawsuit after agreeing in Reg Neg that no suits would be filed during the process. They have also been unwilling to find mutually acceptable solutions to the various issues. To give them priorities or leadership roles will make resolution even more difficult.

#### **2.C.8 Partner with a local business organization to develop information on resource-based business opportunities.**

##### **Definitely Effective**

- Encouraging service based businesses such as Bird Watching guides and shore fishing guides should be encouraged as long as the activity is conducive with appropriate activities in the park. These "vendors" should be permitted and pay a premium to do business within the park. Monies from these "special use" permits should go to the related budget that maintains the section of the park being used by said vendor as well as to enforcement budgets. I suggest a 50/50 split of this revenue.

##### **May Be Effective**

- Not sure what 'resource-based business opportunities' means. Sounds like guide services, maybe?
- In Ocracoke a business provides tours of Portsmouth Island. Perhaps something similar would do the bird-watching or shell collection tour?
- A business involved in bird watching, shell collecting, as well as in tune to people that love nature and wildlife, would be an asset to this island.

## **Not Effective**

- Should be done by professionals.
- don't see how this meets your objectives
- Personal opinion: local businesses will develop and act on opportunities significantly faster and more effectively than NPS – they don't seem to need encouragement.
- I do not believe NPS ought to be encouraging new businesses in the area. That is not a cost NPS should shoulder. The park ought not be in the business of subsidizing new businesses just to increase visitation.
- Limited by seasonal economic restraints, low public demand. Would not be conducive to status quo. It is not desired to make this a Wally world tourist attraction
- We should not be trying to increase development. Quite the opposite on barrier islands
- If there is a need or market opportunity...someone will develop it.
- Resource based business opportunities" this is so vague, I have no idea how to interpret it. As per 2.C.7 above, anything beyond the current park based programs for resource based activities, is a function of the private sector not the park service.
- Let the businesses determine the development opportunities. If they don't do it, there was no need anyway.
- Even when out of state birders do come to Hatteras the local bird club feeds them at a covered dish meeting. I think that there are at most two bird stores on the entire Outer Banks which tells you something about how much money they spend. A Birder Friendly Business and Birder Friendly Community training program was held 10/18/2007 in KDH to train business owners about the North Carolina Birding Trail. Find out how many attended and you get an idea how important birding is here. Thus I am not sure how many business opportunities there are.
- This would make the beach open to commercial interests, maintain the beach for recreational use
- Many local business are already resource-based (i.e., tackle shops) If I can't access the beach via ORV, I'm not going to buy a \$500 surf rod.

**2.C.9** Increase NPS involvement in local festivals to provide information on ORV use and beach resource protection (e.g., continue Seashore participation in Wings Over Water, participate in resource oriented festivals with a focus on the Seashore such as Wildfest).

## **Definitely Effective**

- NPS reps at local fishing tournaments, etc., not as overseers but to provide education and outreach.
- During these they could demonstrate the safe operation of ORVs within the park, as well as explaining to them how to use the corridors to bypass closures and enjoy the park as well as the wildlife.
- Have the park be a positive presence at things like ESA and fishing tournaments.

## **May Be Effective**

- you have lots of options spreading the news. many are designed to accomplish the same thing. these should be consolidated in this document
- NPS should be invited to participate.

- The fantastic resource in surf fishing should be near the top of resource attractions.
- Don't go too far with this one.
- NPS should be involved with local festivals solely to regain the trust of the local community after years of deceit.
- Absolutely--to a limited degree. NPS is doing a fine job and does not need to get bogged down in marketing.
- Wings over Water is a minor activity at the Seashore (only an average of 219 participants in the last six years) and some of them attend no functions at the Seashore. This is an example of misdirected focus. I don't even know what Wildfest is. The most widely attended activities are the numerous fishing tournaments and NPS should be represented at these. They all have to have a permit, does Wings over Water pay a permit fee, if not they should. As a condition of the permit function, information should be made available to participants.
- Not just festivals, but NPS needs to be involved in community events, parades, fundraisers etc. Many residents volunteer for NPS but rarely does an NPS employee or representative participate in community activities

#### **Not Effective**

- This may be effective, however, in no case should resources required for basic services such as maintenance and enforcement be diverted to this activity.

**2.C.10** Submit a weekly article about Seashore resource issues (e.g., notes from the Superintendent) to the local newspaper.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- A monthly or bi-weekly may be more feasible.

#### **May Be Effective**

- But this is a big commitment. Does he/she have time to do this?
- Worth try, seasonally adjusted to topic.
- Communications are currently satisfactory. However, the basis and justifications for closures and actions have been historically founded on emotions and not always based on factual study.
- Information should be sent to local ORV/fishing groups for their newsletters.
- And what the local ORV organizations do to help, beach cleanup etc.
- A good idea as long as the current superintendent stays around as he seems to be a trustworthy representative of the park service.
- This could be a good way to keep the public informed.
- If they include a map of safe ORV and pedestrian access, so as to make the article unbiased, and demonstrate the parks efforts to balance recreation in the park with the wildlife.
- Why not use an RSS feed off of the CAHA website to provide this feed to all interested news orgs and third parties? This is a least cost solution that ensures all have timely relevant information

#### **Not Effective**

- The current weekly press releases are sufficient. I sincerely doubt that the park superintendent or any other upper level management figure has the time for anything more than what is being disseminated through the weekly press releases.
- NPS website is sufficient. Why pay to publish.

**2.C.11** Provide a workshop for store owners on beach driving and resource stewardship to help improve the knowledge of species life history and reasons for protection.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Tackle shop owners definitely have a one sided view to this issue
- Getting information to the economic base of the community lets the non-beach related industries know how important beach access is to their bottom line.
- With some sort of "Beach Friendly" window placard.
- Non resident property owners, and accommodation providers should be included. Realty agencies have annual outings for owners where presentations could be made. Providers of information must be knowledgeable and not just there.

### **May Be Effective**

- you have lots of options spreading the news. many are designed to accomplish the same thing. these should be consolidated in this document
- Voluntary...
- Beach closures affect business so if you have a beach closed for a none endangered species then you may not get warm welcome.
- I'm not sure where the connection is with store owners. Certain stores, tackle, fuel, surfing, kiting...I see the connection.
- Good idea if it can be combined with a commitment of the store owners to impart the information to their customers. Such people need the information to make certain they support the resource protection goals
- Business owners are mostly concerned about their livelihood and probably have no interest in species life history.
- I can't see why shop owners need to know this more than anybody else
- And encourage all to take a stake in the future use of this park.

### **Not Effective**

- No benefits for store owners.
- I believe 98% of them are quite aware of this information already.
- I think this is not particularly useful, except for those businesses that relate to the beach - tackle shops, guiding services, etc.
- most businesses have enough problems already and may not want to take on this chore or extra employees

- The current literature is adequate. It is however, frequently based on emotions and not factual. Studies have been limited.
- Store owners do not or are not the only ones driving on our beaches
- Store owners could probably teach the park personnel more about beach driving and stewardship than park service personnel can teach them. Quite simply, this is a waste of scarce resources.
- The park service needs to go to a workshop provided by lifelong residents of the island to improve the park services knowledge of the history and importance of beach driving and species life history.
- Would have to check with stores and what stores. Many will be too busy. Most bait stores would probably go well beyond what is needed. Most tackle store owners are well aware of stewardship and what is needed.

**2.C.12** Create an “adopt a plover” program and partner with universities and schools to shadow NPS biotechnical staff.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Yes, adoption gives ownership. Adopt Sea Turtles as well.

### **May Be Effective**

- If a plover can be found
- For students with an interest in this area. What is the cost and is it worth it?
- I am suspicious of the word “partner,” which often means paying someone to do something they ought to be doing anyway. Such linkages with universities, etc., ought to be done as much in their interests as that of the Park Service
- This could track the fate of the birds, and show that ORV use really has no impact on their survival.
- Why not include NCBBA & OPBA, ASA, & United 4 Wheel, they have been asking if they could help provide biologists so they get a better understanding
- as long as this is not a work around for bird enthusiast to get access to closed areas when the rest of us are kept out. If it is for legitimate research, ok but I think I see thru this approach
- Sounds like a good idea. Sour spot for the rest of us when it comes to these birds. I want them to see them survive but we spent more money on these birds --- how about the fish. The poor foxes, raccoons etc that have been killed off to save the plover.
- Guessing that most OBX school children regard plovers as undesirable species.
- As long as these partners are informed of the sad state of affairs as far as this species survival rate within the park, due to storm erosion, as well as pollution from houses built next to the ocean and sound. Also, these partners need to be informed that there is no information.
- Although I think "adopt a plover" is a foolish term, the concept of partnering with schools to shadow NPS has merit. Why not the "Shadow a Plover" program. In reality, that's what they will do.
- May be more effective on turtles.
- Programs such as this are good ideas however I do not understand why they are included in an ORV management planning document. These programs should not be paid for by ORV revenues. The park should adopt the policy that all researchers or research projects conducted by other than government agencies should be

considered another user group and should comply with the same regulations as all other users of the park  
Special use permits could be granted but should fall under the same fees and policies as any other vendors.

### **Not Effective**

- Increases traffic in plover areas by untrained people. Note the number of hatchlings killed by rangers in prior years.
- are there consistently enough plovers to realistically make this work?
- You need to take a good long look at the MONIES spent on the plover... Are you getting your money worth??
- With the fluctuation of bird concentration in this area, being that it is in the far southern reaches of the nesting area, I feel this is a good idea but not for this area.
- Equal protection should be given to all species. this is our natural resource and that's what need to be partnered with as a whole not one area of protection.
- Would definitely disturb nesting
- The whole premise of resource closures is that plovers and other birds are reported to be easily disturbed by human presence. This being the case, human presence should be kept to a minimum, NOT INCREASED by having anything more than essential staff in nesting areas.
- Don't the plovers have enough to put up with already without hordes of people shadowing their very existence if they do manage to fledge
- Cape Hatteras is not part of the historical range of the piping plover; current number of pairs too small.
- The lack of affordable housing in Dare County could make it difficult for non-local students to participate.

**2.C.13** Implement more educational programs in local schools and expand the Junior Ranger program to include more web-based options to interest youth in Seashore resources and stewardship.

### **Definitely Effective**

- If cost effective
- Necessary in long haul.
- more children today are computer smart
- Need to get the kids involved in the out of doors and get them away from the computers. Take a kid fishing program. Only 30% of kids fish – how many do you think are into bird watching?

### **May Be Effective**

- you have lots of options spreading the news. many are designed to accomplish the same thing. these should be consolidated in this document
- Expanding programs in local schools is a no-brainer. But there are limits to what web based programs can do. Expanding the Junior Ranger program is a fine idea, including contacts with and teaching resources for teachers.
- The Junior Ranger program should be expanded but the kids don't want to learn this stuff from a computer, they want to learn it outside where they should be. Why waste more money on developing web content?

- If these same junior rangers are to be looking at the seashore resources and better beach stewardship with equal vision in both eyes. Meaning, giving them a full picture of what the Ranger's job is. By making sure they understand the sole purpose of being a Ranger is to balance the resources with the recreational enjoyment of the park.

### **Not Effective**

- Increases in educational programs may be effective if they do not detract from day to day seashore management and enforcement and if they are not conducted as an environmental indoctrination. With impressionable youth it is extremely important to provide a balance of views so that they can form their own opinions.

**2.C.14** If an ORV permit system is developed, include an educational component in the permitting process to promote better beach stewardship and safe beach driving practices.

### **Definitely Effective**

- I cannot imagine a permitting process without it.
- With permit system in place, adequate info/guidelines should be available and violations of guidelines result in permit cancellation.
- I could only support a permit system if it was priced so a person only at Hatteras for a week would still find it worthwhile. Also, all funds collected stayed in the Park and were dedicated to be used only for ORV issues and management.
- A must. If you issue the permit, you must educate.
- Not unlike the Hunter Safety Course.
- Should be modeled after Cape Cod National Seashore – people must come in person to see the educations/resource film.

### **May Be Effective**

- This is getting the information out there, but most people don't even read their own bills.
- Again I am completely against a permitting system, if that does occur, an educational component could be of value.
- could be done by a brochure and a short exam. avoid a formal "training session."
- A short flyer may help.
- An educational component would be difficult to implement.
- I'm not fond of an ORV permit system, but if it will help the occasional visitor, or the ATV users, to respect the resource and treat it accordingly, then that would be a significant improvement.
- If completed at time of purchase of permit
- Reg-neg is going to have to answer this one. Money could dictate how far this could go.
- This scares me, I can see the NPS govt. based overly involved system to get a permit, a costly permit, and an educational program process. It can be done, just doubt if the govt. can do it and esp. the NPS. I am only hopeful. I am at the OBX because as a Vietnam Veteran I fought for Freedom and I like the freedom and openness of the OBX. Make it a burden or take away my freedoms – I may have to move to the Caribbean islands. This would be fatal to the financial status of the obx.

- Coupled with the fact that all users should have a permit system attached, both pedestrian and ORVs should be permitted. Thus, not only educating the ORV users on the “what to’s” and “what no to’s” but to educate the pedestrian where and where not to go when a closure is involved. These birds are much more afraid of a pedestrian nearing the closure than an ORV. A permit system needs to be a balanced system, obtaining money to map off and or stake off all beach closures, as well as money for the park rangers that would have to enforce these permits.
- Permits and programs associated to them including education of public not considered effective. NPS lacks resources and manpower to implement and enforce.

### **Not Effective**

- Might work if self administered over the web, with print out diplomas
- Permits in this Park would be a disaster for all of OBX. Tourism would be greatly reduced and the businesses that depend on tourism would collapse.
- Permits and all associated programs are part of the negotiated rule making process.
- I grew up with a permit sys in new jersey and to date it restricts access to those with privilege and money
- Permits are not necessary. Poor driving practices are limited to immature drivers and should be handled by deterrents with higher fines and stronger enforcement.
- This should be for first time applicants as most who visit do so on a yearly basis
- All discussion of this topic should be limited to Reg-Neg
- No permit system is useful. What kind of educational component would you need other than “air down and drive slowly”?

### ***(no selection)***

- You can do this without making us buy permits. A pamphlet would do just fine at local stores, tackle shop, parks and ramps.

### **Additional comments regarding Education and Outreach options:**

- The more information that is easy to access the better, users find it a more rewarding and less stressful experience if they have a clear understanding of why an area is closed, ie resource management, flooding etc.
- I think the NPS has already done a great job. The key is to continue on a local level and get as many people to do the work for you. Many of the ideas above are great and will only improve the situation. The problem most of the time is the lack of communication or miscommunication. You will not always have full classes or one hundred percent participation, but the word and knowledge spreads and that’s the key.
- You should review existing education and outreach programs for NPS facilities as a guide. As examples of partnering with local groups and volunteers, see Rocky Mountain National Park. Many of the suggestions will be effective if they can be supported financially.
- Articles and Publications that find there way to rental homes would help spread the word
- Some possibilities here, but where will the NPS get the manpower and resources to implement these ideas??

- This is a simple matter. Biologists make subjective determination. Beach access is inhibited. All effort and monies should be used to mitigate loss of recreational areas. Funding would be wasted on much of this.
- Permits in this Park would be a disaster for all of OBX. Tourism would be greatly reduced and the businesses that depend on them would collapse. Permits are unrealistic given the volume of visitors and the many access points to the water.....and closing access points to the water is an unworkable solution for the American public who owns this Park.
- 1. Education is key to sustaining the health of the Park. We need to prove it where possible.
- I'm all for education, but schools and groups such as boy/girl scouts can do a lot on their own. NPS staff should encourage and make resources available, but I'm not sure some of these proposals are worth the potential cost in time and money. Basic information should be available and encouraged to be displayed at key spots such as motels, beach related businesses, museums, visitor centers.
- Education is a key factor in preserving all natural resources and is very important but, must not be established and/or dictated by special interest groups.
- The "Junior Ranger" is a great tool to use in the middle and high school. It'll put a young man or woman that was raised on the island to work for the island. It's a win win situation!!
- Obviously more is better, but make sure you know who the target audience is and ensure they are being reached effectively and economically. Also, understand the practicality of mandating training programs, which might take some time, for people who are only visiting for a week or a weekend.
- I have been visiting the park for over 45 years. I make on average about 152 visits to the park per year. Education and outreach have some benefits overall are deemed low value given the cost of staffing and budget. The real gains can and should be made in the areas of effective communication especially around the closure restrictions, basis for closures and options. There are plenty of stakeholder websites and links could be added to address the communications elements.
- I have been a resident of North Carolina for 36 years and have frequented the Cape Hatteras National Seashore since I was old enough to walk. My earliest memories as a child are from walking and driving with my parents down the beach. We have met some of the finest people in the world while visiting this beautiful beach line. I am an avid fisherman and lover of nature and try to instill those same principals in my children and everyone whom I speak with on the beach. Protecting our natural resources is of the utmost importance to me personally, but there has to be a common ground between access and protection. The first step is education.
- As a relatively new visitor to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore via ORV, I have found that other help educate on proper beach driving and laws. My primary reason to visit is for relaxation, spending time with family and friends, and fishing
- I leave the beach cleaner when I leave than when I arrived. My wife and children do the same. Consider a program to promote all visitors do the same.
- I believe that most issues related to beach/wildlife/resource preservation and management, as it relates to ORV operation, would benefit dramatically from strict adherence to, and enforcement of, laws/rules and regulations already in place. A greater visible presence on the beach would likely provide sufficient disincentive for those very few individuals that generally seem to cause the problems we're all familiar with.
- As in the first section there are many options presented. Most have value. This will obviously become a question of where do we apply the limited resources? Some of the ones in this section are of very questionable value for the resources that will need to be expended.
- All education and outreach programs will only be as successful as the amount of funding available. Concentrate on educated free access to the beaches.

- Many of the options in this section seem worthy at first glance. But taxpayers do not have bottomless pockets and the NPS does not have an unlimited budget. Who is going to pay for all these programs???
- Education outreach should be focused on our natural resource as a whole along with history of uses not only the protection of endangered species.
- I have been visiting the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area for the past 20 years. My family and I make 6-10 trips per year and we spending at least one thousand dollars per trip. Keeping the beaches open for ORV use is very important to us. We would cease to vacation here if ORV access were eliminated or severely restricted
- I am a proud member of both the North Carolina Beach Buggy Assoc. (NCBBA) and the Outer Banks Preservation Assoc. (OBPA). One of the remits of both groups is to educate the general public on Beach Respect.
- I have been a resident of North Carolina for 67 years and have frequented the Cape Hatteras National Seashore since I was 24 years old. We have met some of the finest people in the world while visiting this beautiful beach line. I am an avid fisherman and lover of nature and try to instill those same principals in my children and everyone whom I speak with on the beach. Protecting our natural resources is of the utmost importance to me personally, but there has to be a common ground between access and protection. The first step is education.
- There should be somewhere in this workbook for a person the indicate how often they have used this park over the years. Some of these questions could extremely hard to understand for the random and infrequent visitor.
- Education and outreach programs are required for endangered species protection, unauthorized actions within the park's boundaries, expanding junior ranger programs and educating public citizens in promoting better beach stewardship and safe driving practices; especially in first come, first use recreational situations. The hiring of additional rangers, promulgation of park notices and regulations and the increased presence of NPS personnel (not interpreters) is required throughout the park (stationed on the beaches and available to the general public). The attempts of having tackle shops local businesses, local cable TV, ORV groups and internet websites conduct park business on an everyday basis is extremely naïve.
- In the past I have made up to 6 visits a year to the park. In 2007 I was there from June 2-9, June 23-30, Nov.23-Dec.2 and Dec29-Jan.1 (2008). The park should remain open for the public. I have seen far too many unnecessary closures in the past.
- Education could be a two edged sword, propaganda could negate all that we have worked for. Some who might want to help, will undermine the progress made so far in Park utilization.
- Education is a great thing however its effectiveness is always in question. Also, education at any cost is not an option.
- There is already an abundance of information and assistance available to park users--i.e. signage, web site presentations, links to the NPS web site, the "Outer Banks Beach Basics" video, etc. This being the case, efforts to increase education and outreach likely have minimal impact. That said, since information is friendly there is no reason to ignore this option so long as resources required for basic services such as maintenance and enforcement are not diverted to this type of activity. Finally, when dealing with the impressional youth, it is extremely important that all presentations be balanced.
- Educate to make each responsible for preserving our Coast
- Provide education to ORV users about other places where they can take their vehicles. There are plenty of other places. We do not have to open the National Parks system to them when there are vast areas, including the North Carolina beaches, where they can drive ORVs. Provide education about the massive cost of managing ORV access on the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, including the cost of defending ORV use and destruction against lawsuits that have been lodged and will be lodged if ORV access is continued as is. Provide educational materials about the loss of species and habitat on CHNS. It is clear that the ORV proponents' form of education ("Piping Plover Tastes Like Chicken") mocks the NPS educational responsibility. Young people should be made aware that their national park is being destroyed for the short-lived, one-generation pleasure of a few privileged people.

- It is counter productive for any NPS employees to explain resources management procedures to the public as merely following laws with the caveat that they don't necessarily agree with the laws but it is their job to enforce them. The Park should use every opportunity to embrace the Park's Resources as unique, special and a privilege for visitors to experience. The flora and fauna should be marketed as assets for public recreation not a hindrance to the enjoyment of recreational users. The Park should incorporate public relation marketing strategies to achieve this. Special interest groups should be responsible for beach driving etiquette. The Park should be responsible for beach driving rules. Workshops and literature should be readily available about recreational resource opportunities in the Park.
- Our local population is our biggest asset. We need to expand in all possible ways to include them and help raise up the next generation of beach users and protectors.
- More & better information provided via all of the media & outlets mentioned in this section is a good idea. A CHNS ORV Access Website, kept up to date in a positive and informative manner might be an effective way to communicate current status of wildlife activity at each ramp. Or, better yet, a changeable sign at each ramp:
- The sign would show the location and type of nearby wildlife activity and closures. For example ".5M N Turtle Nest Hatch By Aug 15". Please, let's try more information and cooperation before increasing closures and instituting an expensive permit system.
- I visit this park at a minimum of 8 times per year. Six or more of my visits are for 3 to 4 days. At least two of those annual visits is for a week or more. I have been coming to Cape Hatteras since 1971. I have yet to see where permits would be required and I cannot understand what problem permits would resolve.
- I have been mobile surf fishing for recreational purposes at the CHNRS for 38-years and make approximately six (6) week-long visits to the Park every year.
- I agree that most of the proposals in this section can, if implemented successfully, be effective in promoting greater understanding and appreciation- among seashore users. I ,however, do not agree with hiring new personnel to promote the education and outreach when the greatest need for additional rangers as I see it is for rule enforcement. Most rangers with whom I have had contact are good stewards and communicate well in the education and outreach application. I have felt this is an integral part of their training as well as their innate aptitude for the job. Incidentally I am more than a casual visitor, as I have owned a non rental house in Frisco since 1964. In 2007 I spent 59 nights in my home and was on the beach for at least 55 days and I expect to spend over 100 nights in 2008 health willing.
- Most of the local and those who fish the beach an awful lot are stewards of the beach. Training/educational programs are needed for those neophytes that visit the beaches and want to drive on the beaches.
- Videos specific relevant issues regarding visiting CHNS(RA) would be a useful educational too on the local cable channel. The history of the area and Diamond Shoals would draw more viewers than people trying to sell lots. An educational video on beach driving on local cable would be effective as well. Issues like "AWD is not four wheel drive " and the necessity of decreasing tire pressure could be addressed. My wife and I have bee doing education on beach driving for nineteen years, usually after the driver is stuck. The lessons have been affective (especially when the tide is coming in) and the vehicles are usually unstuck without a tow.
- Vast majority of times NPS commitment to Natural Resources is limited to basic funding with high probability of less in the future. Don't allow that.
- I realize that this is directed at developing an ORV Plan but "Education and Outreach" must include all visitors and residents, not just ORV users
- MOST OF THE LOCALS AND REGULAR VISITORS RESPECT THE BEACHS,WE NEED TO EDUCATE THE NEWCOMERS TO RESPECT WHAT IS HERE AND ENJOY,TO RETURN SOON.
- I found the questions difficult to understand & have been coming to CHNS for 35 years; therefore I am sure others will find them confusing. To validate one's comments, I think there should be a place to state how long & often

someone visits the park. Permits are required in CHNS & all discussion of them should be left to the Permit Section of this workbook or Reg/ Neg.

- Classes with permits so everyone knows how, what, why, and when
- The National Park Service has a record of providing good information to the public. I think that this work should be encouraged and expanded. Do not depend on state or local governments or the business community to do this work adequately.
- The educational process is very costly when related to the number of willing participants. ORV operations instructions/pamphlets seem to be everywhere and in everything we read on the island. I don't believe were ever going to save the novice who takes a weekend drive. My suggestion here is to follow a "wisely cautious" rather than a costly approach...
- Education and outreach are a great idea if carried out in a factual and unbiased endeavor. Its very important to educate all in such a manner that the ideal is separated from the extreme and people are educated rather than propagandized. Permits are a terrible idea. The size and make up of the beaches would make this a nightmare to enforcement. if the law enforcement staff are expanded or would be ensured and the need for permits negated. Please do not go there. It would anger and embitter visitors and local populations into a lose-lose situation.
- With the amount of predatory animals in the park, I don't think man and orvs are the main concern. The eggs of the plover and other endangered species should be collected and hatched in captivity. This has worked in other areas and I cant see why it wouldn't work here.
- I have driven these beaches for over 35 years. An ORV plan must be simple to understand, to follow and obey, and to enforce. Bringing up other facets (passive use, temp and seasonal and village ocean front closings simple make the plant larger than it is). Use designated ramps, speed limits, rules of the road. Allow ample space for ORVs. Set aside day/seasonal use for passive visitors. Patrol, police and ticket violators. Ramp 4, on Holidays, is crowded, beef up law enforcement on the 2 or 3 times a year this happens, rather than design a plan around a situation that only happens 2-3 times yearly. Put adequate signage about rules at each ramp, with a statement that ORVs operated on NPS beaches will conform to the rules or be fined. Move turtle eggs to hatchery. Keep in touch via weekly press releases (Cindy does this now), and sent to hotel tackle shops rental offices.
- Some of the questions are lacking in enough detail to be able to answer, even for locals. Other locals would likely understand and also long time park visitors but would not be easily understood by others. We are local and are in the park on the beach at least 50 times a year.
- In the 80's and 90's there were more birds nesting with open access. There were more ORV's. when resource management began doing bird tours and bothering the plovers, they no longer came there. If you are going to allow anybody close to nest then you might as well have a plover hunting season.
- I feel that there is a need to increase the awareness of visitors, through pamphlets/talks etc. to the needs of the Hatteras Seashore.
- Most of the questions imply locals using the beach, or, at best, a tourist with extra time on his/her hands. Many of the "miscreants" I see on the beach in the "off" season are young with out-of-state tags. I seriously doubt even a university accredited program will stop their nousance. Good old fashioned law enforcement is the answer!
- I have been visiting the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation area for the past 20 years. My family and I make 6-10 trips pers years and we spend atleast \$1,000 per trip. Keeping the beaches open for ORV use is very important to us. We would cease to vacation here if ORV access were eliminated or severely restricted.
- I think most of this section is a good idea. Permits are not a good idea because free and open access is what visitors come to the Outer Banks to experience. Besides this the NPS doesn't have the resources not the manpower to enforce it effectively.

- I found that this workbook was not prepared properly. The questions were misleading and confusing. I am aware of several individuals that gave up completing this workbook out of frustration.
- The starting premises of questions were not accurate. Status quo was misleading and unacceptable. The time “before” status quo was left out. The starting point should go back to the minimum of 1972 (Carter’s Executive Order). This time period is not addressed in the workbook. The absence of historical, traditional, and cultural uses are not addressed in this workbook.
- Questions on species protection and management are not in the same context as the other sections. Most people are not familiar with species requirements and have no clue about the data available. This section should be dealt with separately from the ORV plan.
- The electronic format had its problems from the start.
- The time allotted was short for the due date of the workbook to be completed. The workbook was late to be released to the public.
- The current lawsuit by Defenders of Wildlife and the Audubon has a negative result on the public. Public feels they are being disenfranchised on the success of the Reg-Neg process because these groups are “going to the well twice” to get an unfair result before and while this process is taking place.
- Education and outreach is a difficult task for NPS. The majority of the park visitors are weekly rentals or day use visitors from the areas north of the park. These visitors want to tour the area and visit the beaches via ORVs or by walking. Most visitors will not take time out of their vacation to attend educations, training, or information sessions.
- Please educate our children about species protection and resource management in a fair and unbiased manner! At the same time educate them to the fact that ORV’s are not running over Piping Plovers and Sea Turtles. I am tired of my child being told that ORV use is bad for the environment, and if the “teacher” person said it, it MUST be true! So the parents are wrong and bad folks for using ORV’s this is completely unacceptable!
- NPS should educate visitors on the benefits/ advantages of walking in the park instead of how to drive in the park. Every NPS staff member should be introduced to the park’s natural resources as part of their in-house training.
- Federal and state governments now hire more than half the workforce in this country, paid for by the rest of us workers. Any educational materials and awareness programs should take this into consideration when they want to expand the scope. Finally, the beach and seashore are ours, the peoples of this great nation. We all own them, we all need to protect them. We don’t in general, need to be told how.
- Anything to improve public awareness on beach driving safety, resource management and endangered species is a wonderful idea. The only problem is having the money and personnel to do the above. Volunteers are usually limited when the actual time comes to do anything. Channel 12 is a great way to get through to visitors and locals along with handouts at local tackle shops and visitor centers. Getting the schools involved is another good idea, these children are the future users of our beaches. Websites are probably the bests in that it can reach many people.
- The more you can educate the visitors to the objectives, functions, rules and regulations of the Park the more likely they are to abide by them. Often visitors to the Park are just not aware of the rules. Part of the education program could be to let visitors know how they might volunteer to help out with projects NPS wants to get done.
- I believe the more information that is made available to visitors, young people, students, children and any and all age groups, the more understanding and willingness to help in whatever capacity that person is able.
- Education in increments is a viable option. Visitors are interested in the island, its resources, history and preservation and will absorb information posts on bulletin boards, handouts at shops/restaurants/real estate businesses, etc. and signage at ramps and parking areas. However, forced to attend class and study for vacation will turn visitors away from the island, a definite suppressant of the economy.

- I am a firm believer in education. You can't expect a person to act properly if they don't know what proper is. The problem is how to get people to be educated. At the current time manpower and financial restrictions reduce education to signs, handouts, mailings and possible web site information. All have some value but the information presented needs to be displayed imaginatively, eye catching, quick and simple to read, in short – like a commercial targeted for teenagers. Ask rental agencies to include information handouts in their catalogues, web sites, and in their contractual mailings as well as pamphlets in their rental houses. Ask businesses, especially beach and bait and tackle shops to include a flyer with every purchase. Increase road side signs with descriptive literature, and maps especially at the most frequently accessed locations.
- I first traversed these beaches in the late 60s and continue to visit every year. I am a member of the Virginia Beach Anglers Club, twice past president and currently on the board of directors. I have fished the team tournaments since 1970 and consider beach driving to be a very natural thing. I consider myself to be respectful of other people and the other life forms in the seashore. CHNS is a special place and much of it can only be enjoyed and appreciated through the ability to drive on the beach. When I was much younger, I sometimes walked considerable distances to fish. I still do, but to a lesser degree. I don't think I've ever driven any guests on the beach that they weren't totally enthralled by the experience. I certainly hope this continues for a very long time!
- There is already an abundance of information and assistance available to park users--i.e. signage, web site presentations, links to the NPS web site, the "Outer Banks Beach Basics" video, etc. This being the case, efforts to increase education and outreach likely have minimal impact. That said, since information is friendly there is no reason to ignore this option so long as resources required for basic services such as maintenance and enforcement are not diverted to this type of activity.
- Finally, when dealing with the impressionable youth, it is extremely important that all presentations be balanced.
- Most infractions are as a result of a lack of knowledge. Any clear signage is a benefit as is personal education. Reaching individuals is extremely difficult since so many visitors are only here once in a lifetime or very infrequently. Locals, frequent visitors, clubs & associations should be solicited regularly for input, not as individuals producing singular ideas but as a wealth of knowledge to be shared with park management. Establish an advisory board/group to help with decision making on a regular basis (knowledge is being ignored & wasted by overly zealous managers protecting "their" territories).
- I visit Cape Hatteras Recreational Seashore two to three times a year. While many of the ideas in this section would help raise awareness of seashore issues, both the NPS and the local residents and business communities don't have the time or funding to make them ultimately successful. Education and outreach options need to be scaled to the wants and needs of the locals and the number of available volunteers.
- I believe the Park can provide the public with education through means of web sites, e mail, pamphlets distributed in local villages, at Park sites. For the most part, on site education should be limited due to overall resources.

### **3. Law Enforcement**

**3.A.1** Enforce proper trash disposal (pack in/pack out) and anti wildlife-feeding regulations throughout the Seashore. (*status quo*)

#### **Definitely Effective**

- The same time the resource police or park rangers are out checking fishing regulations they could be asking if resource users need a trash bag.
- A few more low profile signs regarding feeding of wildlife and a few more small dumpsters are warranted.
- Yes, more dumpsters are needed. An exception to this should be the feeding of sea gulls. This is a activity many children enjoy.

- Rangers should be more educated in relations with laws instead of being ticket happy. There should be more rangers as there were in the 70's and this would be possible without budget increases if the resource management was reduced. These officers trained properly could manage many of the resource problems without need for constant presence of the resource rangers.
- Also maintain dumpsters to dispose of the trash when leaving these beaches. Anti-wildlife feeding should be enforced throughout the park.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Trash disposal is the major issue that I see. How can we keep our beaches clean and encourage everyone to pick up at least one piece of trash that they see on the sand?
- May be status quo, but there are not enough law enforcement presence to enforce this.
- Trash I agree with. But getting rid of bait by dumping it in the wash should not be considered wildlife feeding. Chips and fried chicken I would agree should not be fed to anything. Bait should not be included in any such regulation.

#### **Not Effective**

- There is no enforcement of most of the Park rules now....there are not enough enforcement officers.
- While this year's enforcement personnel were more visible, enforcement, in terms of fines, was typically limited. There must be a cost associated with actions that violate park rules

**3.A.2** Provide periodic nighttime patrols to observe and enforce compliance with regulations and closures. (*status quo*)

#### **Definitely Effective**

- The word "periodic" is wrong. Money needs to be put into enforcement, as it is too thin. Although fishermen are not the major violators of resource closures, some manners need reinforcing.
- Increase these patrols while ORV use is allowed.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Patrols at any time are welcome....more often in heavily used areas would help in compliance issues
- Nighttime patrols' may be warranted in peak-season high use areas. The current NPS budget shortfalls in the area of law enforcement should be addressed. This is based on the increasing numbers of visitors to the park.
- Patrolled in high use areas randomly.
- These need to include preventing camping, and drinking of alcoholic beverages, of all kinds, even of canned beer. Law enforcement has been lacking in the past with random nighttime patrols. An enforcement officer has to be there to pick up a phone call for a reported violation at all times.

#### **Not Effective**

- Not cost effective. Most night time use is by serious fisherman who are in general good stewards of the beach and its resources.
- I have never seen a night time patrol for enforcement. Instead I have seen numerous remnants of fireworks (mostly in the areas adjacent to the villages) and beach fires above the high tide mark or during the ban on beach fires. In-season more emphasis on night time enforcement in front of the villages and campgrounds should be encouraged.

- Increase night time patrols, or close the beaches at night. Not sure anyone has ever track time of day usage, but fish don't wear watches.

### 3.A.3 Maintain a 10 mph speed limit for essential use vehicles. (*status quo*)

#### **Definitely Effective**

- I have often seen Park Service vehicles speeding on the beach.
- or less

#### **May Be Effective**

- 25 mph in some places should be safe.
- Speed limit is appropriate, but likely unenforceable due to lack of personnel resources.
- There are plenty of areas where a higher speed can be safely driven, ramp 45 to 49 & 70-72 for example.
- I don't know how you enforce the speed limit. I'm opposed to radar, etc being used on the beach. To do so would be too costly, as well as create an atmosphere of law enforcement presence that is not necessary. A Park Ranger riding up and down the beach is excellent LE personel presence and visibility. I think speed limit should be voluntary as it is now> BUT i think the speed limit posting should be 15, maximum of 20. 25MPH is not necessary.

#### **Not Effective**

- There are times they just need to get there.
- There is not enough enforcement now for the 25MPH speed limit. How would a lower speed limit be enforced to a higher degree? What are essential vehicles?
- Nobody can drive 10 mph... the current speed limit is fine. However, plenty of folks abuse that and should be ticketed.
- 10 MPH is slow if there is an emergency, OK for routine use
- Common place observation to see driving in excess of 35 mph
- Although 15 to 25 would be better. Maybe lower near and around the passive areas: A speed limit is simply not enforceable giving the current levels of enforcement personnel.
- Why should essential use vehicles be required to observe a lower speed limit than the general public? If there is an emergency or a need for law enforcement, I would think you would want these vehicles to get to their destination as quickly as possible.
- 10 mph is fine near people and parked vehicles but not for open beaches where economics of fuel mileage as well as time considerations are valid
- Try 15 mph.

### 3.A.4 Increase visitor access to information on beach driving requirements.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Should be done through the rental agencies.

- This would improve the knowledge base of the visitors, but large signage is not necessary. Low profile signs may be helpful.
- Signage & brochures are low cost info tools

### **May Be Effective**

- Materials must be quick study prepared with minimal requirements similar to the quick set up with a printer for a computer, etc. with total requirements included or separated if the user wants to take the time to read all the details. People don't read signs unless they are short straight forward and then some don't even read the short ones. Keep it clear and concise

### **Not Effective**

- There is already an abundance of information and assistance available to park users--i.e. signage, web site presentations, links to the NPS web site, the "Outer Banks Beach Basics" video, etc. This being the case, efforts to increase education and outreach likely have minimal impact. That said, since information is friendly there is no reason to ignore this option so long as resources required for basic services such as maintenance and enforcement are not diverted to this type of activity.
- Much more effective if done through visitor center or local businesses. There should be signs at each ramp entrance that education is necessary when driving through the park.

### **(no selection)**

- Strike the word "requirements" and use the word "courtesy" or "guidelines" or "rules"

**3.A.5** Ensure enforcement has an educational component (e.g., provide equipment for education, video).

### **Definitely Effective**

- Minimal requirement and standard approach
- Yes the park rangers are often very adversarial.
- Met and worked with some fine rangers, have met a few who ruined it for the whole staff. They need to understand their educational and good communicational skills.

### **May Be Effective**

- Video is a good option and well as literature
- too much maintenance. Seashore is already providing a lot of information at different venues.
- Law Enforcement should always focus on actual enforcement and not education. Adequately trained LE personnel should always supplement educational programs but never be the primary tool of an educational system.
- A simple "specific" handout, coming from a LE Ranger, could produce immediate results.

### **Not Effective**

- let enforcement do their job and have other park personnel do the education
- When I need a Park Ranger I do not want him educating elsewhere. I want him on the beach, enforcing.

- There is already an abundance of information and assistance available to park users--i.e. signage, web site presentations, links to the NPS web site, the "Outer Banks Beach Basics" video, etc. This being the case, efforts to increase education and outreach likely have minimal impact. That said, since information is friendly there is no reason to ignore this option so long as resources required for basic services such as maintenance and enforcement are not diverted to this type of activity. Given the wide availability of information, the focus should be on enforcement of rules.
- If we're smart and we are sighted for a violation, we won't need an educational video. We will have learned from our mistake and won't do it again. The government doesn't need to treat us like children because we drive on the beach to go fishing.
- This would be impractical due to the fluid patterns of seashore visitors. I often arrive around 1 or 2 AM and fish all night before checking into my house.

**3.A.6** Standardize signage on all ramps and explain the regulations in place at the Seashore so visitors understand what is considered a violation.

**Definitely Effective**

- This is very much needed. It should be consistent and implemented in a low profile as to not deter the rustic charm.
- I see this as being one of the most important things that could be done to protect the resource.
- Some of the words on these signs need to be in larger letters for easier reading without having to get out of the ORV and walk up to the sign.
- Again signs must be definitive and very short. People don't read signs

**May Be Effective**

- Very few people take the time to read long wordy signs.
- I believe signage is already pretty clear, however, more information on the bulliten boards couldn't hurt.
- We shouldn't be so dumb to have to be told not to leave our trash on the beach, but hey, there are some idiots out there so I believe this suggestion would be effective.
- Ramps are not a good place to disseminate information.

**Not Effective**

- Too many signs

**3.A.7** Provide signage at Seashore entrances so visitors are aware when they enter the Seashore.

**Definitely Effective**

- And at each end of all the villages.
- .. and when users enter the village and PINWR. ex. LEAVING CHNS ENTERING DARE COUNTY

**May Be Effective**

- Some signs as you enter areas to update you on current conditions may help.

- This is only necessary on a very limited boundary only method. We do not overt signs at every ramp for example. Just along the high volume travel routes and on the boundary only.

### **Not Effective**

- I believe the sign at the beginning of highway 12 is clearly visible.
- Everybody already knows that your there when you cross the bridge.
- It's not the entrance that visitors have problems with. The problem is knowing which land is public and which land is private with in the Seashore boundary.

**3.A.8** Increase presence of law enforcement (LE) personnel on the beach by increasing staffing, as funding allows, and by improving schedules and assignment of existing LE staff.

### **Definitely Effective**

- I've never had a bad experience / interaction with LE in the park. It was always professional.
- Yes this is needed but a balanced approach required. An optimum staff study should be conducted.
- Not so much LE but NPS personnel for primarily PR and education purposes as well as LE
- Yes, a more visible presence would remind people to obey the laws in place.
- LEOs should always be on the seashore beaches, ramps, and inlets in my opinion and not out on Hwy 12 patrolling. There are Highway Patrolmen for that.
- Uniformed rangers as good will ambassadors will be less costly, but LE needs to be increased.
- Find dual-purpose rangers. A law enforcement ranger that has a resource and interpretation background and can perform dual functions.
- During summer season

### **May Be Effective**

- As funding allows. I am all for patrolling usage areas but as has been the case for many years OBPA and NCBBBA promote reporting offenses to the park service by users.
- I have not seen many law violations. However the Park may consider its own emergency number similar to the State Polices #77.
- Vast area of coverage, encouraging the reporting of violators and enforcing steep fines for certain violations is a better cost solution
- Maybe during high volume dates but the public should do more self policing. The public should have access numbers to contact LE officials to report violators.
- I'm not sure about this. We really don't need the man breathing down our necks while were vacationing with the kids but I will agree that there are some idiots that visit the park and may need some supervision by the man.
- This is the most important need that exists as I see it. Although I am opposed to the attitude of some past rangers who loved to show authority with their hands on their side arms. Good, well trained "people persons" could do a good enforcement and educational service at the same time.

- Enforcement is critical to any plan. However, it is very important this be kept in balance to preserve the culture of the Park. LE personnel on the beach will be needed. The number needed is the big question. Constantly patrolling and "over-doing" LE personnel presence will harm the culture of the Park.

#### **Not Effective**

- LE on the beach is sufficient as it is now, the cost is not warranted as most fishermen will report violators and you will see them somewhere on the beach with LE officers. We have to rely on self policing our resource even if it calls for reporting violators.
- I come to the shore to experience a wonderful bond with mother nature. Law enforcement presence is a deterrent to this. I can not voice strongly enough my opposition to increased law enforcement presence.

#### **3.A.9 Increase emphasis on patrolling resource closures and issuing violations for resource closure violations.**

##### **Definitely Effective**

- Even those who are against closures[ like myself] generally respect them and don't want them disturbed
- This is the only way some will get the message
- Clearly resource closure areas should be a high priority.
- Increase patrols by foot and use binoculars for patrolling passive areas.

##### **May Be Effective**

- Install cameras for monitoring.
- This could be advantageous to flexibility of boundaries safety to the animal resources and efficient time use of closure.
- Again the public can be empowered to report violators
- Are resource closure violations a problem? I'm on the beach a lot throughout the year & I can't recall anybody but rangers inside the closures.
- Even more effective to come when called by those observing violations.
- Also allowing these same patrols to educate ORV operators and pedestrians on routes that bypass closures to ensure safety of wildlife within closure and still allow enjoyment and access to the beach.
- Balance is the key here. An extreme would be to have LE personnel at each turtle nesting area 24/7. This would destroy the culture of the park. At same time, emphasis on violations must be part of the plan. The public needs numbers to call and methods to use to report violations. The Park should be set up to respond in a reasonable time to the reports.

#### **3.A.10 Adjust fines for violations to improve compliance.**

##### **Definitely Effective**

- Nothing stings like loss of money (or Portuguese MOW)
- Adjust both up, and down depending on nature of violation
- Yes larger fines would be a stronger deterrent. A staged approach based on the type of infraction and repeat offenders should have higher fines

- All park users who violate resource closures need to pay for that privilege
- Increase the fines for any and all illegal activities
- Litter signs and fines need to be increased. Especially in front of the villages where people have been known to leave awnings and chairs which tend to blow away overnight.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Uncertain what the word "adjust" means. Maybe a sliding scale—that goes up with repeated violations.
- I don't know what the fines are now, but they should be at least \$100.
- This might be effective for repeat offenders, not necessarily for a first time offender.
- Except for the publicity regarding the ramp 4 arrest last summer I don't recall ever reading about any fines. I have long held that publicly posting arrest information and fines would be helpful
- Similar to a "Work Zone" on the highways where fines are higher do the same for resource closures/

#### **Not Effective**

- The fines in place now are out of control.
- Increasing fines don't work –(for example)with the high cost of tickets and insurance for speeders – even at 3-4 miles over the posted speed limit people still zip by me no matter what state I drive thru

#### **3.A.11 Raise fines, especially related to dog off-leash and alcohol violations.**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- The dog off-leash problem is serious and not enforced
- Add speeding, failure to remove dog feces, littering to the list.... and make the fines substantial!
- Leash laws should be maintained in high volume and passive use areas, but leash laws in less congested areas may be relaxed as long as the dogs are under voice control or in the water. The public safety attributes should be well protected by this method. Add a fine for not removing pet feces.
- Only if dog is off leash among visitors. If someone is walking their dog off leash on a barren section of beach the Park Ranger should use discretion.
- Coordinate with local law enforcement officers to administer sobriety test ORV beaches.
- Add littering and speeding to the list
- Alcohol violations should not be accepted even in the cases of canned beer. It should be considered drinking in public or drunk driving as it would under normal circumstances if they were not in a national park. Dogs should be on leash at all times, and should even be allowed in the water without a leash. An animal such as a dog can move so quickly it could be inside a closure and do irreparable damage. Neither should be tolerated.
- Pets off leash (not just dogs).

#### **May Be Effective**

- Better enforcement is what is needed.

- However, more likely that education and consistency to be more effective
- The 100 dollar fine is adequate for dog leash violation. Not sure about the alcohol.
- Not sure alcohol is that big a problem, it is just the easiest to track and ticket.
- Dog off leash should be seasonal. There's something un-American about not being able to take your Labrador to chase a tennis ball on the beach... there is such a thing as TOO much legislation.
- Community service might be a better route.

### **Not Effective**

- Dog off leash violations are law enforcement's low hanging fruit. Nothing makes a NPS ranger appear more silly to most beach users.
- raise fines for all violations- not a select few
- Most dogs are harmless. There are other laws in place to address alcohol abuse.
- Warn dog owners first. How many 2<sup>nd</sup> offender do you have now for dogs or alcohol?
- The penalty should be sufficient to provide a deterrent. That said, I don't see how leash law or alcohol violations warrant more of a deterrent than do resource violations.
- The problem is the reckless driving/alcohol related or not. Signage is appropriate to keep dogs on leashes.
- I've never seen an unleashed dog while fishing the outer banks?
- Alcohol violations are a nationwide issue, fines and arrests don't seem to help when they are slapped on the wrists in court. As for dogs, until an effective education program is in place and operational, visitors should be educated first! Better signage with the fines clearly shown would be a better deterrent than fining a person who didn't know, and who now has a bad taste in their mouth for the Seashore!
- Creating an atmosphere encouraging voluntary compliance has better long term potential. For example, if off-leash focus were shifted to off-leash and out-of-control, then enforcement could focus on those cases where an off-leash animal was actually causing an issue

### **(No Selection)**

- No, that's Punitive, we are trying to increase responsibility!

**3.A.12** Lower fines for the first dog off-leash offense, but increase fines for second offense to encourage citing people with dogs off-leash and reporting of violations.

### **Definitely Effective**

- More reasonable than 3.A.11.
- No horses on beach, no one picks up horse poop.
- Pets off leash. Educate/warn first, fine when/if blatant or if animal is imposing or frightening visitors.

### **May Be Effective**

- At least increase fine for additional offenses after first one, but not necessarily lower it for initial violation – warning citations may be acceptable under limited circumstances.
- The 6-foot leash is a little restricting, with a truck backed up to the beach and a dog on a 10-foot leash hooked to the truck could not reach the traffic area or areas they should not be in.
- Same comment as above except I do now recall reading of a citation where an individual was exercising a retriever and who was under the impression it was legal to work with a trained retriever in the surf.

### **Not Effective**

- I say set the standard, and have 0 tolerance. (and I have a dog I bring with me)
- Dog off leash violations are a waste of rangers' salaries.
- There should only be dog fines if the dog is behaving inappropriately or the owner is inattentive.
- At almost any public area in America.... pets are kept on a leash for the publics' safety. Pet owners know this!!! Why is CHNSRA different? PUBLIC SAFETY!
- a slap on the hand for a first offense accomplishes nothing....stiff fines and strict enforcement goes a long way
- with proper signage, there should be no grace period
- Post rules and enforce as any other rule
- Why lower anything? Do your best to ensure people are aware of rules but punish them when they don't comply
- A second violation should carry a higher fine. That said I am not sure this is practicable. The remainder of this alternative is so poorly written, I can not interpret or evaluate it.
- Lowering these fines is not effective, but raising them would be effective. Encouraging reports of violations also would help.
- Rules are rules. If you enforce them religiously, people will obey the laws. Pets are to be kept on a leash in almost every public area in America. The National Park is no different. Rules are Rules, Enforce the ones we already have.
- Place leash laws at all access points and ask all rental agents to post them in cottages-1<sup>st</sup> offense should be \$200.00 and all others the same.
- Written warning for 1st offense. LOWER fines for dog off-leash violations unless violation involves a resource closure.
- The first dog off leash should be given a warning. For example: One in a life time warning. Warning would be entered into system using owners name. On second offense, have a \$100 fine. On third offense significant fine (\$250). On fourth offense, owner can not have pet on beach for one year. Dog owners that do not control their pets should be fined and habitual offenders removed from the beach.

**3.A.13** Use a tiered fine system for all offenses starting with a lower fine for the first offense, increasing with each subsequent offense.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Seems like this would work if applied systematically and data held for extended periods of time. Worth a try – but not to lower initial fine too much.

- Probably a good idea, but it implies a real-time information/data system by which. Law enforcement staff can learn whether anyone in particular has earlier offences of record, much like State highway systems are doing
- Yes larger fines would be a stronger deterrent. A staged approach based on the type of infraction and repeat offenders should have higher fines. Add fines for pet feces and littering with higher fines for repeat offenses

### **May Be Effective**

- On some things this would work, I think littering, dogs on leashes, and out of bounds should be very severe from the get go.
- AT what cost? How would it be tracked?
- The fines should be based on the severity of the offense.
- Only for the less serious concerns such as dog leash violations, etc.
- Would rather see a warning for the first time offender, many people just don't know they're breaking the law despite all the signs that are present
- Except for dog on leash and beach speeding. Limit dog leashes to six (6) feet.
- Establish list of consequences for ORV infractions that might range from warnings and fines for less dangerous or serious infractions to a loss of driving privileges and large fines for serious safety and resource violations.
- Eithers your premise is that with a lower fine possible people would deliberately risk it, or if a question exists that perhaps it is an ignorance of the law case why not a first warning.
- Not sure how you keep up with this. 1 fine reduces questions and confusion, I think.

### **Not Effective**

- stiff fines, strict enforcement and a word of mouth on these will go along way in getting the word out that NPS is serious
- if they screw-up, pop them the first time
- Some offences need to be stiff the first time. Going into a nesting area, or digging up a turtle nest, speeding, donuts, etc.
- If you start with big penalties and enforce them from day 1. People will get the message quickly.
- I like the tiered system, but for some offenses, a warning is much better than a fine. The culture of the Park is friendly. Let's keep it that way. A kind and friendly warning explaining the rules in many cases will solve the problem. Then go to the tiered fines. But once warned, fines get expensive!

**3.A.14** Reduce current Seashore-wide speed limit from 25 mph to 15 mph year-round.

### **Definitely Effective**

- There is no need, absent an emergency to go 25 on the beach.
- Presume this is limited to beach driving – slower is better if enforced.

### **May Be Effective**

- Driving on sand with certain vehicles and airing down may make that tough.

- In some spots 25 mph is safe.
- Might be hard to keep some cars at 15mph, 20 mph might be a good speed to be able to stop in time if there is a problem or people ahead.
- There are some places where 25mph is appropriate. Have a lower limit for congested areas only.
- I would base this on history of violations and other data.
- 15 mph is getting a little slow, I don't see a problem with 20 mph to 25 mph.
- Consider what is done on Highway 12 with changes to the speed limit on a seasonal basis.
- Vehicle speedometers may vary on the beach due to various conditions. Maintaining a certain speed can be difficult so there should be a variance of leeway.
- A lower speed limit in season or on heavily used beaches may be effective but the most effective measure is to enforce the speed limit as posted. In this regard, LE should focus attention on hard packed beaches where speeding is more likely to occur because of the favorable terrain. Similarly, LE should focus attention on beaches with high density use--the more people, the more likely speeding will occur, and the more likely that a visitor will be placed in danger by a violator. A perfect example is ramp 49, flat hard sand and heavy use by families. On the other hand beaches such as ramp 38 can be barely passable due to deep soft sand. Speeding in such areas is next to impossible thus LE, at least in terms of speeding, is much less of a factor.
- Lower speed limit would be more effective.
- Slower is better but a max of 20 is good.
- Fifteen sounds difficult to control – could live with 20 as a max.
- 15 mph – during summer 25 mph from Nov-March
- Near villages & high density areas. Many miles of the beaches do not require this.

### **Not Effective**

- I don't believe that I have ever been over 20 mph on the beach, and 25 is the highest rate of speed to safely operate a vehicle even on packed sand.
- Not practical during low use periods
- 25 MPH is not enforceable..... what would make 15 MPH enforceable?
- Speed is dictated by beach conditions and traffic. Not necessary to reduce to 15 MPH
- Many soft areas of beach need to be negotiated faster than 15 MPH
- There currently is not enough manpower or resources to enforce the current laws why add new if you can't enforce what is already on the books
- Why so much of a change? How about a compromise of 20mph?
- A 25 MPH speed limit does not cause long term impact and does not result in a safety risk and should be maintained.

- Although 15 to 25 would be better. Maybe lower near and around the passive areas: A speed limit is simply not enforceable giving the current levels of enforcement personnel
- Make it seasonal ..... 25MPH during winter is more than acceptable.
- 25 MPH is a safe speed in most instances. Perhaps a lower limit within some set distance of other people would be warranted but very difficult to enforce.
- Not effective due to the inherent problems of detection and enforcement.
- Beaches like Frisco #49 to #45 would be maddening at 15mph, the same for some other areas
- Appropriate speed for the conditions is the issue. 25 mph between ramp 30 & 27 on an uncrowded beach at low tide is fine. 10 mph when there are kids running out from between ORVs on a narrow beach is too fast.
- Most beaches will not support a 25 MPH speed, but sometime in late fall and early spring when few visitors are around there may be a flat section where 25 MPH may be maintained for a short distance. Possibly a 15 MPH in the May15-Sept. 15 could be considered.
- I think the 25 mph limit is fine except for around campground areas where it should be reduced to 15 mph.
- This will only slow the good driver, and it won't do anything to the speeders.

**3.A.15** Provide electronic speed signs (“posted speed limit” vs. “your speed” signs) at congested locations.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Maybe, on a limited and periodic basis. They apparently work—based on their use by local authorities, but they are a big visual intrusion that I wouldn't want to encourage.
- These speed signs may lead to increase the congestion.
- With even wood "rusting" at the CHNS, it will be hard to maintain these signs. Also, ORV do not travel in a signal path
- To let people know it is patrolled. Consider it their warning.
- Only if you ticket offenders. Plus can those types of signs withstand the environment?
- Occasionally perhaps. But this addresses my concerns for moving our seashore into the” asphalt jungle” syndrome..

#### **Not Effective**

- This would incur expense that would most likely not stop speeding violators
- Would ruin the whole seashore experience
- Impractical unless there is a pass through corridor
- Costly .. the money could be used elsewhere.
- Can't believe that electronic signs would hold up in Seashore beach conditions. Exclude ORVS from pedestrian congested beach areas and significant reduction of speed at congested hot spots for fishing.
- I don't believe this would be effective except on paved, regular, roadways.

- Congestion would seem to limit speed.
- Warning a violator doesn't work
- The few people who drive too fast couldn't possibly care less about an electronic sign.
- Cannot see this – it is a beach --- can only think of a couple of areas where it is needed. Think money could be better spent. One patrol car at the speed area.
- Having rangers around does more to control speeders.

**3.A.16** Selectively do radar enforcement of speed limits on congested beaches.

**Definitely Effective**

- No warning tickets.

**May Be Effective**

- If the ticket is just a fine and not toward your drivers license or insurance.
- Why “selectively?” Why not routinely?
- Current enforcement staffing levels would have to increase to do this. Should be used on a limited basis primarily during the summer season.
- Shouldn't take away from other enforcement measures.
- Why limit this to congested beaches?

**Not Effective**

- Increased fines for major offenders that don't require setting radar traps. The time can be better spent.
- LE personnel are much more effective roving the beach than sitting in one spot with a radar gun. Someone traveling at an unsafe speed on a beach is obvious, you don't need radar to tell you this.

**3.A.17** Prohibit beach fires from 11 pm to 5 am.

**Definitely Effective**

- For animals and to be honest, all bonfires should go if you ask me.
- This would also cut down on alcohol related problems.
- Without further data, presume beach fires during turtle nesting season would be deleterious.

**May Be Effective**

- Does this include grills used for cooking burgers at 2am while we're waiting to fish the 4am high tide
- Maybe keep them in an approved drum or barrel.
- Yes, during turtle hatching periods, especially. I am uncertain what the benefits might be at other times except in times of very high fire danger, and beaches don't burn—though the debris from beach fires can be troublesome.

- This should not be implemented park wide. There are high volume areas and areas near the villages and housing centers that need this so it should be implemented in a needed basis. The bigger issue is when the party building the fire does not clean up the next day.
- All fires below high tide line if not a ticket.
- Is this a problem when burning from a pit?
- 2100 TO 0500

### **Not Effective**

- I'm Drum/Striper fishing at night and build a fire... what's the big deal. It's not like I can burn anything down.
- beach fires are fine if the rules are followed
- Fires have no effect on the sand.
- The weather should decide this.
- The point of this would be what? To prohibit an activity just to prohibit it, for no other purpose? As long as fires are below the high tide line, any remnants will be removed within a maximum of 11.5 hours. During turtle hatching season this may be effective, but is completely not called for on a year round basis.
- Definitely no. Would lead to many half burn piles of wood and the useless expense of enforcement
- Prohibit fires not associated with camping during this time frame
- I see no problem with beach fires below the high tide line. Enforcement of the location of fires is an issue as I have seen such fires that were hot enough to explode a beer bottle. Again, such activities are generally within close proximity to the villages and campgrounds. There needs to be more emphasis on night time enforcement in and near the villages and campgrounds
- The only limit to beach fires should be metered to how dry it is do to a lack of rain
- Prohibit all recreational activities and access from 11 pm to 5 pm if there is not sufficient Park staff to patrol the area.
- Where the beach fire is can have as much impact as the time of day or night. Requiring a free permit , possibly available on the internet, to limit the location of the fire.
- Below the low tide level is safe enough. Fireworks is a different story. Do not want my house burned down by grass fires or rough fire. Only if during a drought.
- There is no data to support the concept that closing the beaches between 11 pm and 5 am will be beneficial. Closing the beaches at night would deprive many fisherman of the ability to fish. It would be unfair and is unnecessary.

**3.A.18** Close beaches to ORV use from 11 pm to 5 am year-round.

### **Definitely Effective**

- except in the case of an emergency

### **May Be Effective**

- I can support this concept. It is also an incentive for users to not stay overnight. The problem may be that there are just not enough places for the ORVs to go off the beach.
- Could be effective, but would be hard to manage.
- I suspect there is a lot of joy riding during these hours. Hardly a time to be surfing, watching birds, or sunbathing. However, some folks probably do want to fish, so very selected areas might be open during these hours. BUT not the entire seashore as it is now.

### **Not Effective**

- This would close the beach to night time (prime) fishing times and prevent fishing tides
- Part of the visitor experience is fishing and star gazing at night and one of the best place is on Ocracoke's south point.
- This would not be fair to drum fishermen and others who prefer to fish at night.
- This would be almost impossible to control and with about 4 miles between ramps there is much room to spread out. Even at ramps 43/44 there is much room, not all ORVs go to the point
- As with 3.A.17 – What would be the point of this? It would be a prohibition for the sake of a prohibition, with no benefit to the resource as a result, but a serious detriment to the people who choose to enjoy the resource during these times.
- Not necessary fewer people are on the beach at that time.
- As per the FONSI, there is no documented need for this action.
- Is someone going to chain the ramps every night and unchain them again every morning?
- This is definitely unfair to many surf fishermen. If you want to stop people sleeping on the beach then close the beach for a one or one and one half hour period in the middle of the night.
- This is part of the best fishing times. Lowering the night time speed limit to 5 mph would be good.
- Most problems occur before midnight and more enforcement is what is needed, not closed beaches.

**3.A.19** Limit the number of vehicles allowed in highly congested areas during high visitation weekends (when one vehicle leaves, another vehicle is allowed entry).

### **Definitely Effective**

- One approach to reduce impact on resources, number may be limited to zero in select seasons for endangered species.
- Good idea, and unless beach occupancy by ORVs is capped (perhaps by permits) the time will come when limits will be essential. I would prefer to cap users now. Once a much larger number of users are on the beach, it will be almost impossible to reduce their number.
- Carrying capacities should be set in all areas of the Park.
- Even parking lots have a max number of spaces. Question is, where do you get the personnel to manage it?

### **May Be Effective**

- your asking for trouble...you will have a have more law enforcement on hand to control the crowds
- some discussion of carrying-capacity and how it is calculated should occur before this is attempted.
- This is a very subjective and would be controversial. Data and research would have to be involved.
- A lot of man power will be needed to enforce this regulation not to mention the frustration and arguments that will occur while waiting in line.
- Bullpen areas would have to be created and be very large
- This would require additional NPS personnel. It would also take these personnel away from other areas, which may need attention. It would also take these rangers away from patrolling beaches for violations which is more important
- But only where there is absolutely no more room to park. However, I see a problem with uneven application so you would have to have an absolute parking capacity criteria to go by
- What if people are going to the bathroom and left the rest of the family on the beach? Also making the point in Buxton a surf fishing area only would greatly reduce the number of vehicles during holidays. Too many people go to the point to just party which does not mix well with surf fishing. Kite boarding has also become a problem at the point.

#### **Not Effective**

- Some portions of the beach are more desirable than others at different times. restricting the number arbitrarily only favors some users over others and causes more problems. Signs that inform users at ramps how many are there will help.
- Many people travelling long distances and will not visit the parks if they are not sure if they will be permitted to enter.
- Management nightmare, and who and how determines appropriate number of vehicles?
- Seems extreme and difficult to enforce. This could create a backlash of negative reactions by some.
- There is no fair way to determine who can be on the beach and who can not. This is another form of denial of access.
- Common sense should tell people to move to a less congested area. If a crowd gets too big, then law enforcement should be able to require dispersement to a reasonable level
- Here on Assateague Island it just pisses people off to wait in line and go a few miles down the beach and see no-one around because the bulk of the folks on the beach are in the first 3 miles
- When overcrowding occurs, most people will regulate themselves by leaving or picking another spot.
- Memorial Day 2007 at Oregon Inlet was the only place and time I thought too many vehicles were on the beach.
- Extra cost for enforcement and it would shut out visitors.
- This is pretty much self regulated at this time. Most folks that use ORV beach driving will chose a less congested area over a congested area. If the ramp infra structure is improved then the congestion will be reduced by that strategy.
- Not needed, there's still plenty of room during a 'high visitation' weekend

- or maybe - after a 3-5 year data collection and analysis is undertaken to determine parameters
- Assateague Island limits the number of vehicles allowed on the beach but they have a single entry point. I do not see how you could implement this.
- Many day tripper from the Hampton Roads area not come hurting our economy
- Waiting in line for beach access is not my way to spend a vacation
- How would you determine when too many are there. Some hold 4 or more folks, others 1 There are times at the Point when trucks are 6 deep and it is not crowded.
- Limiting the number of vehicles is not practical or, in some cases, desirable. For example, a run of spanish mackerel, bluefish, drum, or striper at the point can attract enough of a crowd to have vehicles 3 deep. Visitors to this area expect the crowd and I would venture to say, you would have a riot if you tried to keep anglers away from such an event. As another example, during the summer months ramp 49 can be extremely crowded. This is because multiple family units will purposefully congregate in one area to set up a picnic, including volley ball and quates. Again, this is part of the experience sought by visitors to this beach. In both of the above examples, the desirability of limiting vehicles is suspect or at least the limits should be different than at other areas. Finally, even if you could define a limit, the park does not have the staff required to enforce a limit.
- This sounds like the Cape Point closure checkpoint, only worse. A long line of grumpy surf fishermen sitting in hot ORVs confronted by a couple of well hassled, grumpy rangers.
- What problem does limiting the number of vehicles fix? The issue is not the number of vehicles, the issue is enforcement of the current regulations.
- too much management. If the beach is open, it's open. gates and road blocks would not work.
- There has been one area only that problems have occurred due to high volume of users (Oregon Inlet). More patrols by enforcement and other park personnel in "enforcement" colored vehicles would make the need for this requirement to be of no use. NCBBA and CHAC have offered in the past and been refused the establishment of a citizens patrol to rove these area without confrontation but for reporting to on duty rangers needed enforcement.
- This will lead to angry visitors and a huge waste of fuel while people protect their families by using the air conditioning. This is just a bad idea.

### 3.A.20 Prohibit alcohol Seashore-wide.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Why not? Seems most other public parks already do this.
- East of dune line
- It would tame some of the bull-headedness. How would this be policed? Cooler checks, someone walking through the fishermen and radioing in infractions(undercover)
- Yes, prohibit it in ALL National Parks, Hatteras Island was historically a "dry" island. Only in the last 25-30 years was alcohol available for sale. Could solve a lot of problems.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Excessive use is not a major problem.
- May meet some objectives, but I think continued proper enforcement is the way to go.

- spot checks and stop can be effective

### **Not Effective**

- This is impossible to enforce fairly.
- Visitors to the seashore are there to relax and enjoy, some like to consume alcohol. As long as they are not exceeding the legal limit if driving and are not a public nuisance.
- This is impossible to enforce - ask your rangers and they will tell you.
- There currently is not enough manpower or resources to enforce the current laws why add new if you can't enforce what is already on the books
- Enforce public drunken behavior and/or DUI for folks operating ORV's in an impaired state.
- This will not work unless all vehicles are checked before entering the beach. Where will the manpower and financing come from?
- Do not allow loud or obnoxious behavior, but if someone likes a beer with his sandwich that should be permitted.
- Prohibit "excessive use of and intoxication". Prohibit use of "hard" liquors, same as the rest of Hatteras Island, but permit beer only
- I don't drink on the beach but see no problem with the current regulations. If you have proper enforcement personnel this should not be a problem. My replies seem to go back to the number of people on staff I notice.

**3.A.21** Enlist citizens as volunteers to provide information (including the beach ambassador programs) regarding rules and regulations of the Seashore.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Maybe OBPA and similar groups would be effective. They should be easily identified.
- Have seen this work successfully with adequate training and management of volunteers.
- Totally agree .. this can be very effective and there would be no shortage of volunteers.
- Dress them in NPS uniforms for better compliance. Are there enough citizens available for this?
- This is what is needed. With the GREEN MOVEMENT" in full swing empower the people to protect and self police the resource.

### **May Be Effective**

- you have lots of options spreading the news. many are designed to accomplish the same thing. these should be consolidated in this document
- Probably not really effective. People just do not like to snitch on others. Nothing wrong with trying, however.
- Could work if properly supported, but depends on volunteers so could be unreliable
- NCBBA and CHAC have offered in the past and been refused the establishment of a citizens patrol to rove these area without confrontation but for reporting to on duty rangers needed enforcement.

- May work. I've done this some. People come up to me on occasion and ask questions. I help best I can. Once, I took 2 couples for a ride on the beach and showed them how to fish. They fished for about an hour. They loved it

### **Not Effective**

- Web sites and publications are sufficient
- I do not want a volunteer citizen explaining to me the rules and regulations.
- Rangers should police the beach.

**3.A.22** Establish and publicize a phone number the public can use to report violations on the beach.

### **Definitely Effective**

- This is an excellent idea. Wide dissemination of this type of system will protect the resource, and be effective in eliminating activities that are detrimental to the resource including wildlife and dunes.
- Guarantee that someone will act promptly on the report
- And post the violations ... the same as is done in local newspapers today.
- This has been discussed on several outer banks fishing boards and has over-whelming public support
- Most ORV users that I know already have these numbers programmed into our cell phones. But once the number is called, an LEO presence is needed.
- A reporting number prominently posted would not only help those who want to be good stewards but would act as a deterrent to would be violators. Furthermore, this approach requires little to no expenditure in scarce resources.
- Even add a web site or email address to report violations.
- Can't they already simply call 911? Dare County dispatch should be enlisted to help the NPS protect the park. Would a phone number require the park to have a dispatcher? This might take resources (money) from other resource management, law enforcement and education efforts.
- Needs to be a number other than 911. The public is reluctant to use 911 in a non-emergency and most non-resident visitors cannot use their cell phone to access a local 911.
- I've done this. Once when a guy was using PWC in Park. Another time, when driver was going too fast. I called, reported the incident, and got a good response in both cases. This works and should be a key part of the plan. Neighborhood watch programs work well!

### **May Be Effective**

- If it's a simple # than all cell phones can reach - i.e. #88
- Due to current laws, unless a ranger sees the offense, it is unenforceable. However, a ranger should be sent to investigate
- If manned 24/7 like Dare and Hyde dispatch, which seem perfectly adequate at present since they have contact with all on duty LEO including rangers.
- You cannot get the local rangers office 90% of the time now and unless you are going to a 24 hour dispatch system to handle all call by a live person it will not be effective.

- The permit system should be discussed during the Reg Neg process

#### **Not Effective**

- The Ranger has to witness the violation unless the reporter is willing to go to court to testify as to what they witnessed. Most are not.

**3.A.23** If an ORV permit system is developed, educate permit holders to ensure they are aware of the regulations before they operate ORVs at the Seashore.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Why have a permit without this?
- If a permit system is developed it would be easy to add a regulation compliance certification at the time of permit issuance.
- Make users pass a test to get their permit.
- The first to get permits should be all Dare County residents who want them.

#### **May Be Effective**

- If a permit system is developed, it must be fairly administered and not just be a lottery for beach access.
- If it is kept to a simple list of rules and a signature promising to follow them. Also giving a pamphlet with the rules listed.
- I do not support a permit system, but education could benefit users.
- I have previously stated my opposition to a permit so I dislike this hypothetical. However I have heard nightmarish stories of the time consumed at Cape Cod with this educational business that I m opposed.

#### **Not Effective**

- Again, I am totally against a permitting system but if that becomes a fact then yes educate in fact educate with or without a permit system.
- The education can be done without requiring a permit system.
- Permits are not necessary except maybe during the summer season.
- Not required at this time. Not acceptable. Reg-Neg issue.
- ORV users should be well aware of the rules for driving in the Park. Their permits is a statement that they understand those rules and are responsible for checking on-line or at the designated NPS facility to know of any special closures or procedures that have changed. In short it is ORV users responsibility to know and follow the rules.

**3.A.24** If an ORV permit system is developed, revoke beach access permits for serious violations.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Revoke permit as well as fine for violations
- I don't know the definition of a serious violation, but if someone continues to violate laws after warnings and citations have been issued then their privilege should eventually be revoked.

- Yes, but everyone must know in advance what constitutes “serious violations.” Is it something in particular or multiple infractions of otherwise minor infractions.
- Don’t see why you have to have a permit system to ban somebody from the park, if your banned then caught inside then you go to jail for trespassing
- Punishment should be more than a fine. Community service on the beach, cleanup, sign maintenance weed control, ramp maintenance etc.
- Yes, actions need to have consequences.

### **May Be Effective**

- Effective if fairness is applied to the violation.
- If a permit system is developed, it must be fairly administered and not just be a lottery for beach access.
- Effective if permits are revoked for all violations.

### **Not Effective**

- If a permit system is implemented (I am against that), a tiered system for first second and third offenses should be implemented but not permanent revocation.
- You do not need a ORV permit system to do this.
- Not required at this time. Not acceptable. Reg-Neg issue.

### **Additional comments regarding Law Enforcement options:**

- I would ban pets from being on the beach before I would enforce the dog off leash rules. In Rocky Mountain National Park, pets are permitted in vehicles but not on park trails etc. Banning alcohol from the Seashore will be impossible to enforce, and your rangers already know this.
- This can easily become a budget blower. Historically when I have fished overnight, I rarely see more than 3-4 vehicles. The cost-benefit of additional enforcement efforts and changed laws would defeat primary need to mitigate any and all inhabitations on ORV access. Many of the options listed in the above section would only serve to increase administration costs, this defeats primary need to ensure access.
- 1. We need more enforcement and heavy fines of existing regulations. 2. Reduce speed limit to 15 mph. 3. Allow 24 hour use of the beach
- Violations are rare in my experience, but safety is a concern and so there should be serious fines for serious violations.
- We need to enforce the laws that are on the books now, why add new if the resources are not there for current enforcement. A hot line is a good idea but it needs to be manned.
- in the 20 year that I have been coming to the hatteras national seashore and driving on the beach I have never been stopped on the beach and have seen only a handful of park rangers on the beach.
- my comments on this whole section is YES, give us more and better law enforcement. There is more than enough laws on the books, just not enough even enforcement
- Make sure that good sounding plans on paper in fact can be implemented effectively and efficiently

- Limiting the number of vehicles, prohibiting the use of alcohol, and prohibiting fires on the beach at night is MANAGEMENT BY PADLOCK, the easiest and most efficient form of management. THIS IS NOT WHAT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WANT OR EXPECT FROM THEIR GOVERNMENT
- Overall more enforcement personnel are warranted and much could be gained by enforcing the current rules and regulations. Fines for offenses should be better communicated and that would provide a public deterrent. The key enforcement should be in the area of speeding, wreck less driving, littering, and pet feces removal. Higher fines are also warranted and a staged approach whereby higher fines are levied for more serious infractions and repeat offenders will be helpful. Leash laws should be maintained in high volume and passive use areas, but leash laws in less congested areas may be relaxed as long as the dogs are under voice control or in the water. The public safety attributes should be well protected by this method. Restrictions on the number of vehicles, banning alcohol, closing the beaches at night is management by padlock and restricts the liberty and rights of the park users and would result in a diminished attraction to the park. Night time fishing is a prime attraction and should not be regulated. Fires however, may need to be looked at especially around passive areas. The biggest problem with fires is irresponsible folks not cleaning up the next day. Permits are not required nor should be considered for driving or other activities.
- Options 3.A.14 - 3.A.16 seem to imply that the seashore is crowded with drunken and reckless ORV operators speeding through congested areas and endangering pedestrians. My experience is vastly different. Other ORV operators have been responsible and safe with the exception of one incident where a young operator drove recklessly through a flooded area on the Bodie Island Spit. This experience is the exception, not the rule. More Rangers on the Bodie Island Spit would be helpful. On some visits I have only seen one Ranger during a 7-8 hour period.
- There are enough rules & regulations to properly manage the park. Additional personnel to enforce the rules is needed. Increasing the fine structure to deter violation would also help.
- In my 40+ years experience visiting HI, it has remained remarkably unchanged. Make no mistake, this is a HUGE part of the appeal for my family, our extended family, and the significant number of friends that join us on the island. To implement change for change's sake, in the name of "resource protection" or "progress" - and thereby alter permanently the barrier island experience - would be a terrible mistake in my view. I am in favor of permits, etc. to the extent that revenues are used locally and help fund needed improvements. Expert research and analysis should guide any/all decisions that are likely to entail "permanent" change/solutions.
- I do not feel that there is any need to close the beaches after 11pm. Most of the nonsense happens during the daylight hours before dinner time. Night time users as a whole are more responsible and respectful of beach access .
- The emphasis should be to increase access not to penalize or restrict access. There is congestion because more people want to access the beach and are restricted to fewer and fewer areas. This causes more enforcement problems. Spread the people out!
- Enforcement of existing laws should be the priority. There should be no permit system or limit of vehicles on the beach.
- The NPS rangers do an excellent job ... they just do not have the coverage capabilities. Increased staffing followed by more effective administration of the laws/policies of the NPS would be a huge win. People who violate the NPS policies today do so knowing the likelihood of ever being cited, is very slim.
- Definitely more law enforcement is needed. The question is, how do you pay for it???
- Would be a great idea for the numbers of law enforcement officials to be posted. Most law abiding people take great pride in Cape Hatteras National Sea Shore and will welcome the chance to help police themselves and others who don't respect our great treasure. Would also like to see more Ranger patrols on the beach, grand kids love to see and talk to them plus they do help deter speeders and other beach violators.
- A permit system is NOT NEEDED in the CHNSRA. Full funding for NPS so existing rules and regulations can be enforced is the answer.

- The NCBBA and OBPA both encourage their members to report alcohol and littering violations.
- There are sufficient rules and regulations for this Park. The ability to enforce them is severely lacking due to lack of funding for enforcement, and full funding for resource management, does not allow NPS to properly manage any programs new or old. This phenomenon is not unusual in the NPS, but yet the NPS continues to seek out new parks to put into the system. Common sense tells me NPS should take care of what it has prior to seeking out new lands that will also be wanting due to lack of funding.
- The rules and regulations now in place are sufficient but they have to be enforced---More \$ needed for enforcement
- I believe the Park Service does a good job now they should develop a plan to work with local law and not go overboard.
- The rules are already there and are sufficient for safe operation and protection of resource. The problem is simply that NPS does not have enough funding to enforce these rules. More prohibitive rules are not needed..simply more LEO presence
- In my 35 years of ORV use (from Oregon Inlet to Ocracoke Inlet) and driving the beaches and shores of the sounds, I discovered the lack of ranger availability for enforcement to be the most glaring deficiency of the NPS. It is imperative that ranger law enforcement be constant and consistent in all areas of the park.
- There are sufficient rules and regulations for this park. Enforcement is needed for these already on the books
- There has been a lack of enforcement for a long time, the excuse is funding. Funding was found for a SWAT TEAM to stand 24/7 for a month when the Point was closed for the first time. These LE rangers violated this closure by walking into it, when we could not. Anybody doing Park Service work needs to be in a uniform, this includes anybody going inside a resource area. A reflective vest is also a good idea. LE should respond quickly to citizen complaints. Anybody driving reckless should be fined with a stiff fine, and have to do community service as a condition. They should be thrown out of the Park for a certain number of years for those violations, after doing community service. Dogs off leash should be a ticket first time, every time. The same for anybody walking their dog without a means to pick up the poop. No bag, ticket. If there is littering around an ORV and the occupants unwilling to police it up(when asked), everybody in that ORV should get a littering fine, no warnings. If an ORV doesn't have a trash bag/container readily available when asked that should be a fine, there is no excuse. If an ORV comes off the beach from a day's fishing & they don't have any trash from that, there should be a warning ticket. Everybody has to do their part, and the part of others who are too lazy to do theirs. Field sobriety tests should be given to folks out on the beach, and at night if necessary. Please try to be nice with the shining of lights on the water and other fishermen though when doing these tests. It is nice to see a friendly face of enforcement & other Rangers, come on out and say "howdy".
- The current set of rules at CHNSRA is sufficient, if the rules are enforced. In this regard, LE needs to be mobile. They need to interact with visitors in a non confrontational fashion. In the process they may find the opportunity to educate visitors. Given the limited resources LE needs to be focused on high use areas and areas that are conducive to violations--i.e. near resource closures, hard packed beaches that make speeding possible, the villages and campgrounds where drinking, littering, illegal fires, unleashed pets, etc. are prevalent.
- I have never felt un-easy concerning the level of Law Enforcement.
- More law enforcement is unnecessary. Instead have the public alert LE professionals to violations. LE professionals should be stationed at strategic points to field violation calls and investigate. To to this Mile Post signage will be necessary
- Additional rangers are needed to enforce the existing laws. There should be at least one (1) ranger for each ramp or beach access. A ranger should not have to cover any more area than between ramps. If they have to cover more area than this, their response time is too long. In the past when I have called a NPS phone number, which I was given to report a violation, there was no answer or a message that no one was available. I was told to call 911 and they would contact the park service. In the summer of 07, my son called to report a violation of a four wheeler speeding and running in the dunes. It took a ranger over an hour to respond and by that time the violator was gone. The dog leash

law needs to be enforced more vigorously, for the safety of other visitors and sea birds. The fine should be substantial and enforced. Pet owners should also be fined for not cleaning up after their pets. This should also include horses. Signs should be posted, same as fire works signs, informing visitors of the leash and clean up law and fines.

- My friends and I who are ORV/camper owners have fished Oregon inlet on the south side and on more than one occasion walked the parking lot and surrounding grassy areas picking up trash. It looks really nice when were finished – I wish more people could be educated with the concept of using the dumpster for their trash – it really bugs me. As far permits are concerned – we spend enough of our hard earned money on federal taxes – there has never been a need for a permit and I don't think that should change. We are required to purchase a fishing license and have done so since they started a couple years ago. Most everyone that drives an ORV will purchase the license as they are fisherman. This is a valuable tool for management because of the information provided first upon presentation and then through the actual purchase of the license. I realize this is on the state level and hopefully some of these funds can be used for management/enforcement even if it means eventually having to raise the cost of the license in the future.
- It is clear from the options proposed that enforcing rules for ORV use at CHNS is a financial burden on the NPS and the American taxpayer. It is clear that more law enforcement is necessary and will be increasingly necessary, further straining NPS staff resources, subjected staff to ridicule and harassment, endangering the safety of law enforcement personnel, and burdening the American taxpayers. Typical users of the beach do not know how to report abusive use of the beach by ORV users. There is no statement anywhere about what to do when you see such abuse. Voluntary compliance by the ORV advocacy groups clearly doesn't work and actually is counterproductive. Reporting violations rarely results in apprehension. Renegade ORV users are long gone before any law enforcement appears on the scene. Violators often harass those who inform them of the illegality of their behavior.
- You may find some of my comments cynical however please know that I am totally serious. Some of the suggestions in this section would forever destroy what makes this park great. An entire economy of an island would collapse and never recover. More spending of taxpayer money and more red tape is not necessary just to get to the beach while your on vacation.
- ORV permits should be assigned to drivers who pass a written ORV test. ORV drivers are responsible for knowing the rules of the Park. before they access the beach. Speed limits should be adjusted on a seasonal basis. Rangers should patrol in undercover vehicles and uniforms at random intervals and locations at various times of the day. Passive areas should be patrolled on foot. Law enforcement officers should perform dual roles and be able to conduct interpretive programs and resource management, multi task by combing turtle patrol with normal patrol duties and informational resource programs with patrol duties. LE Rangers already enforce fishing and hunting regulations in the Park. Mangers should seek out resource biotechs that are law enforcement rangers and interpreters. In house workshops and training could help address these objectives. Prohibiting late night beach fires but allowing driving on a beach at night is a contradiction. If there is not sufficient law enforcement to patrol the Park at night (11:00 PM to 5:00 AM) then that is sufficient reason to close areas to all visitors. Carrying capacities need to be established for ORV beaches that not only reflect NPS missions and mandates but also are within the bounds of realistic law enforcement resources.
- The biggest task I foresee is how will the Seashore find the funds to provide the increased LE presence and education that is needed to make the beaches safe and fun for all user groups.
- Enforce the existing rules. There are only a few violators. The vast majority of ORV operators are responsible citizens who enjoy spending time on the beach with their families and friends.
- The ability to enforce the current rules and regulations is hampered by the lack of budget for enforcement personnel. There are sufficient rules and regulations in place today. Adding any additional programs requires additional funding. Increase the penalties and fines for infractions of the current rules and regulations and enforce them. Without additional funding, there is no reason to even attempt additional programs. Beach permits are not required. What is required is enforcement of the current regulations.
- Sufficient rules and regulations already exist for the CHNRS. However, the ability to enforce them is severely lacking due to lack of funding for Enforcement, and even full funding for Resource Management will not allow the

NPS to properly administer any programs – old or new. The answer to virtually all of the proper management of ORV's at the CHNRS is sound and effective LAW ENFORCEMENT (!) administered with good judgment and common sense.

- There is nothing wrong with the present speed limits as observed by competent and experienced beach drivers. In a run to Hatteras inlet in mid-December on the hard packed tide line at a time when no one else is on the beach 25 mpg could be perfectly in order. A factor that applies to all driving is “reasonable and proper” under the existing conditions. There are times when 10 mph is too fast, others when there is nothing wrong with 25. The educational proposals should aid in developing more competent and experienced beach drivers and the lowered speed limit will not make for safer travel. Actually 10 mph would keep most transmissions in low gear thus causing even poorer fuel economy than one gets now. Fines vs. warnings? I think there is a place for warnings rather than citations in some situations. I believe maximum benefit from law enforcement citations is not so much size of the fine as widespread publicity of the situation. I have felt over the years that NPS has soft-pedaled law enforcement results whereas in truth the greatest detriment would be widespread publicity . Many of us have witnessed rule breaking especially as pertains to beach driving and we've wished for a ranger's presence. Most of us will call and report a violation but more enforcement personnel are needed as they are currently spread too thin. Over the years it has been suggested to and rejected by park service authorities that responsible members of NCBBA and Cape Hatteras Anglers club be utilized as adjunct unofficial enforcement rangers as they are on the beach for a considerable time in total and can thus increase the eyeballs lwhich can report infractions. Limiting of number of vehicles is not a viable option for Hatteras. Despite the proliferation of vehicles the number has been mostly self regulating. If one can't park to fish he goes elsewhere at the present time. Regulation of number of vehicles such as at Assateague seems to me like a serious over control reaction to a situation which essentially contains its own excesses .
- The lack of Ranger staff needs to be addressed to make any regulation enforcement more effective. This is a budget issue. In our twenty year/seven to fourteen day/three plus daily ORV journeys at CHNS the most frequently observed violation would be unleashed dogs. They are usually well behaved and are staying close to their families but if one unleashed dog decided to hassle a colony of birds tge damage would be done. Alcohol policy is not an issue that needs to be addressed from our experience as responsible alcohol use is not a violation. 99.99% of ORV operators are very respectful of beach closures. The Turtle nests are regarded with awe and as long as skimmers, oystercatchers, and terns don't mind being observed through field glasses they are safe as well. Frequent speeding is also not a constant problem in our experience. We have witnessed one serious violation of driving on the dunes by a Humvee and reported it to the NPS with the help of a local fisherman as our cell phones had no service. You may remember the photos. An official number to call would be effective if visitors have service
- LOTS OF RULES AND REGULATIONS JUST MAKE ENJOYMENT OF THE PARK MORE DIFFICULT AND INCREASE COSTS OF OPERATION FOR PARK SERVICE. USE GOOD COMMUNICATIONS AND EMPHASIZE BENEFITS OF GOOD STEWARDSHIP AS THE WAY TO KEEP THE SEASHORE AVAILABLE AND USEFUL TO VISITORS, RESIDENTS, AND BUSINESSES.
- I suggest that a few more strict requirements be added to vehicles allowed on the beach. ORV's must be equipped with four wheel drive. (This excludes the dune buggies used by some and even now rented by a business within the seashore.) ORV's cannot have more than a 6 inch lift kit. (This excludes many of the trouble makers and abusers on the beach.) Tire size should be oversized but cannot be over a 325 width and non-aggressive type tire. (This requirement goes hand in hand with the 6 inch lift maximum that again gets rid of the “monster” type” vehicles and again gets rid of many of the abusers of the beach. 3-A-11 Raise fines, especially related to dog off-leash and alcohol violations. (Example: Today is Feb. 6 and very few people are anywhere on the beach and if there are no resource closures close by why not play with your dogs in this secluded area) A reminder of the law may be given by the officer if other visitors want to enjoy the same area but otherwise why issue a ticket. (Another example: July any day- If in a secluded area with no nearby nesting enclosures or other visitors are around a reminder of the law with the expectation that he immediately place lease on pet then no violation be issued.) Otherwise on beach with more than the group with the pet around first a warning issued and minor fine on a follow-up encounter with the same group. Pets off-leash going into bird, turtle enclosure should be cause for owner to be given a high cost fine.
- Law enforcement is the key to smooth operation of CAHA. Many conflicts would be prevented if a LE ranger is seen just patrolling the beaches. Violators need to be cited for their violations – the more the better. Most users respect the beach & resource; it's those very few “yahoos” that give the rest of the users a bad name. LE could put a stop to those few who think they can roar up & down our beaches. CAHA could increase its LE presence (year-

round) on the beaches rather than spend \$500K or more on plover protection & solve most of the user conflict/resource conflict problems currently present. Spend the \$\$\$ on LE personnel.

- There has been a lack of enforcement of violations for a long time, the excuse has been funding/staffing. Strict enforcement of existing rules and regulations is needed before creating more rules/regs which will not be enforced. Funding was found for a SWAT TEAM to stand 24/7 for a month when the Point was closed for the first time. Resource management seems to be fully funded; is lack of enforcement money suffering due to everything going to resource management? Anybody doing Park Service work (ambassador) needs to be in a uniform to be taken seriously, this includes anybody going inside a resource area. A reflective vest is also a good idea. If tourists see people without uniforms or special vests entering resource closures, they may think it is ok for them to do it also. LELaw Enforcement should respond quickly to citizen complaints. Anybody driving reckless should receive a stiff fine and have to do community service in the Park. They should also be banned from the Park for a certain number of months (years?) for those violations after doing their community service. Dogs off leash should be a ticket first time, and every time. The same for anybody walking their dog without a means to pick up the poop. No bag = ticket. No warning tickets, people need to begin taking responsibility for their actions. If there is littering around an ORV and the occupants are unwilling to police it up (when asked), everybody in that ORV should get a littering fine, no warnings. If an ORV doesn't have a trash bag/container readily available when asked that should be a fine, there is no excuse. Field sobriety tests should be given to folks out on the beach if necessary and violators fined/penalized according to existing regulations on the books.
- The majority of my time is spent on Ocracoke Island, thus my comments reflect only Ocracoke. The major ORV problems I have seen personally have been: Speeding on beach, Driving while incapacitated, Reckless driving on beach (especially doing "donuts"), Incursion into bird nesting areas, Littering, Occasional crowding at popular sites (South Point at Ocracoke). I haven't seen problems with dogs off leash. Most of these could be addressed with more LE staff patrolling the beach or education. Consider these suggestions: Provide tackle shops with a ORV regulations brochure that would be included when a salt water license is purchased. An on-line version could be available for those who purchase a license via the internet. The NCBBA has a brochure that could be a start. The brochures would be available on the ferries, restaurants, realtors and motels. If I understand correctly, violations within the National Seashore are federal offenses. The speeding ticket in 2007 was the impetus for Judge Boyle to issue his ruling. List the penalties, and emphasize them as federal, not state. Include an 800 notification number to use for calling in violators.
- IF A PERMIT HAD TO BE PUT IN PLACE, USE THE FEE STRUCTURE LIKE THE FISHING PERMITS (DAY, WEEK, YEAR, LIFE) SAME STRUCTURE. KEEP IT SIMPLE ALL NCBBA AND OBPA MEMBERS THERE LICENSE PLATE IS THERE PERMIT.
- Limiting the number of vehicles, fires at night, alcohol use & closing the beaches at night is management by "padlock". That is no way to manage a national park that belongs to every U.S. citizen. This park does not need more rules & regulations. It needs the ones we have enforced. The enforcement staff & budget has decreased while visitor numbers has increased, not allowing NPS to properly manage programs new or old. All the while the budget & staffing for resource management has increased. Permits are not required at Cape Hatteras & all questions concerning them should be limited to the permit section of this workbook.
- Prohibiting alcohol, fires, closing beaches at night is management by padlock. More enforcement is needed to enforce existing rules and regulations.
- Fines need to be substantial and include speeding, littering, picking up after pets.
- There is a budget shortfall in NPS for law enforcement despite increase of visitors.
- Enlisting citizens to provide visitors with rules and regulation information is already being done by CBBA members.
- I have been a visitor to Cape Hatteras area for many years and have never seen a regular presence of Law enforcement on the Beach. How will this be accomplished?
- We need more handicap. There is only 1 ramp for these people who live all year around, and ramps for the handicaps all year around from Salvo to Hatteras Village.

- To not unduly burden the NPS with a high cost enforcement. On each ramp, place signage with large bold lettering. Ranger on duty, cell phone # 1-252-, report any ORV violations, right away, vehicle, make color, and license number very helpful. This way everyone can be eyes for enforcement for the NPS and will likely cause people to think first.
- Limiting the number of vehicles, prohibiting fires, closing beaches, prohibiting alcohol use, is like closing the park for public use. A park is for the people to enjoy!
- The NPS should send a message to all ORV operators on Seashore beaches that they will not tolerate intentional driving in closure area, on sand dunes, or any other restricted areas. Their policy should be that anyone caught driving in illegal area will have their vehicle seized on the spot and not returned to them until their court date. This policy should also apply to serious alcohol related driving infractions., this get tough policy should be advertised in advance of its implementation, but when in effect strictly enforced violator.
- I have always believed that more enforcement of existing rules would negate the need for elaborate systems. The need for more personnel has been evident for a long time.
- If the NPS had more rangers in sight of congested areas. I think that we would have more people following the rules of the road.
- As ORV usage as increased, law enforcement numbers have decreased. Biotech numbers and the taff that supports and manged them numbers over 22 people. Rangers need to be on the beach and visible. ORV users are amrt enough (for the vast majority) to act with care, caution, respect, and courtesy on the beach. If rangers see bad behavior, more to correct it with a warning or a citation! Certain offenses (driving too fast, reckless, donuts, DUI, - issue a ticket on th spot. Word will travel fast, ad the problem should go away. ORV users should not be allowed to block out large sections of beach for football, baseball fields. Recreational activity should not infringe 100's of ft down the beach while other users cant even find a place to park. I read over and over about dogs on the beach. For the most part, owners keep them under control. I do, however, object to the use of horses on the beach, and the smelly mess horse manure can make on a beach when eight or ten of them pass by. Added to that, there is always horse poop in the parking lots where the vanbs are parked to load and off load horses. Only 24 areas to comment on in law enforcement. CNHPS is fully funded for resource management, and lacks funds for enforcement, for any plan to work-enforcement, and ORV plan is worthless to many visitors.
- There are definitely enough rules and regulations for CHNS park, but enforcement by NPS is severely lacking due to insufficient NPS assets devoted to enforcement. Unless NPS can increase its available funding overall, some funding must be diverted from resource management to enforcement.
- I would suggest to enlist the help of the folks that fish at night to watch for violator and have a 24 hour hotline to an officer on duty when they see something going on that shouldn't be. I have been coming to the outer banks since I was 9 and now at 50 I have seen many times I wish I could have gotten in touch with a park officer after 2 am. Ive called 911 on a couple of occasions to report people driving on dunes or folks driving wild on the beach at night. The fishing public are the best watchdogs you have because we don't want to lose our right to fish at night. I use to go to Fort Fisher and fish at night until they started doing the permit thing which wasn't bad enough but they also cut out the night fishing all together until Sept. 15 each year. I have not been back there since, and its only 2 hour ride from my home. I had rather drive 5.5 hours to Hatteras so I can fish at night. You catch more fish and bigger fish at night, always. Please don't shut us down.
- Today-there are electronic signs telling about Ocracoke-We need the same thing year round.
- I feel that there is a need to increase the awareness of visitors, through pamphlets/talks etc. to the needs of the Hatteras Seashore.
- Change the boundary between the units. It is senseless to have 23 to 27 with the northern group while the rest is with the south. 23-27 is very heavily used and by having the 23-34 aplit, it becomes a "step child". In years past I would see a park ranger on most of my beach runs. Now it's the exception. Even when I see one they seldom stop, almost like they are on the clock! Enforcement is the answer.

- A permit system is NOT NEEDED in the CHNSRA. Full funding for NPS so existing rules and regulations can be enforced is the answer.
- Rangers should be there to help the environment and not as the police of the beach. Except in rare cases the police stuff is overdone and unnecessary. Most of the time the environmental side is underdone!
- Being under observation makes me feel uncomfortable. I wish for law enforcement to be out of sight and unobtrusive with no increase in presence.
- Adequate rules and regulations exist at this national park. Enforcement is the lacking factor. Adding more rules to the agenda of the enforcement personnel is not an efficient use of resources or funds. Restricting the recreational value of the national park by lockout proposes no benefit to the NPS or the economy of NC.
- Like most rules and regulations they are only as good as they are enforced. Most of these issues could be controlled with more staff. Education will give people the rules, assuming they read, understand and attempt to follow the information. Only enforcement will see that the rules are followed time and time again.
- We need a sound ordinance, too many times I could not hear the waves over the music blaring. We do not go to the beach to hear a rock concert every day.
- I feel it all comes down to enforcing the rules. The few people that break them will quickly change and the others will follow just by word of mouth. Ninety percent of the ORV abide by the regulation, unfortunately ten percent makes us all look bad. Driving on the beach is not a RIGHT it is a PRIVILEGE.
- Dare County supports active enforcement of the rules and regulations of the park. While Dare County is aware that come law enforcement issues exist, these issues can be resolved by better enforcement and not by closures, permits or use restrictions that penalize those that abide by the rules for the actions of those who do not abide by the rules.
- Existing regulations / laws should be adequate if they are consistently enforced. The suggestions seem to focus on ORV users as a class. While some of the regulations are specific to ORVs, many apply equally to other users of the seashore. Education and enforcement must deal with all CHNRS users. If a permit system is developed, it should also apply to non ORV users. Most National Parks require admission fees or possession of the National Parks pass. This would be appropriate for access to CHNRS also. ORV users should not be singled out.
- Signs should be posted, same as fire works signs, informing visitors of the leash and clean up law and fines.
- Additional rangers are needed to enforce the existing laws. There should be at least one (1) ranger for each ramp or beach access. A ranger should not have to cover any more area than between ramps. If they have to cover more area than this, their response time is to long.
- In the past when I have called a NPS phone number, which I was given to report a violation, there was no answer or a message that no one was available. I was told to call 911 and they would contact the park service.
- In the summer of 07, my son called to report a violation of a four wheeler speeding and running in the dunes. It took a ranger over an hour to respond and by that time the violator was gone.
- The dog leash law needs to be enforced more vigorously, for the safety of other visitors and sea birds. The fine should be substantial and enforced. Pet owners should also be fined for not cleaning up after their pets. This should also include horses.
- As stated in previous answers, I firmly believe that most infractions result from a lack of knowledge. Most serious violations include alcohol and/or the knowledge that there is no enforcement in the immediate area or at a given time of day or night. In other words the lack of sufficient LE Rangers only breeds more infractions. If you cannot hire & train LE Rangers fast enough, hire informational rangers, train them and have them patrolling the beaches in uniform, in marked vehicles dispensing information and when necessary calling LE Rangers to handle infractions. Have a presence; show a uniform, continuing to produce more rules & regulations without enforcement is a total waste of

America's tax dollars. This workbook and FACA would not have been necessary had CAHA management properly enforced standing rules, regulations and laws.

- There are sufficient rules and regulations for this park. The ability of to enforce existing rules and regulations is severely lacking due to the lack of funding for enforcement as opposed to full funding for resource management. This imbalance does not allow the NPS to properly manage existing programs or begin new programs to add value. Both enforcement and resource management must be equally funded. Environmental extremists a quick to point out enforcement violations, but aren't willing to balance the funding. These people need to understand how free and open access, enforcement of well-formed rules, and resource management work together to create a balanced management protocol. I think the NPS management at CAHA should petition the federal government for more funding increase in enforcement of existing rules and regulations would have a direct affect in helping manage the resource and reduce the frivolous law suits which environmental extremist groups such as Defenders of Wildlife use to strangle beach access. Money currently spent to defend the NPS against frivolous environmental lawsuits could be better spent on staff and infrastructure to improve enforcement.
- The main concern here is a double edge coin. Let's be sure we have LE personnel present, that the regulations are enforced, and the LE personnel have a set of regulations that have some "teeth' in them so they can be enforced. BUT, let's also protect the culture of our Park. The culture of the Park is friendly, open, professional. Let's keep it that way. One officer in one truck can cover a lot of beach in one day. The continuing presence of Park rangers is good. too much presence and overdoing the law enforcement is harmful to the culture.

## 4. ORV Permits

### 4.A. Establishment of a Permit System

#### 4.A.1 Continue option of allowing vehicular beach access without requiring permits. (*status quo*)

##### Definitely Effective

- Works now except for irresponsible drivers. You need to find these people and not manage all of us according to their conduct.
- I think this is a national park and paying to camp is one thing, but not to drive on the beach.
- I strongly urge all possible options of managing ORV access in CAHA without a permit system be seriously considered. Permit systems are not always effective management tools and in this case, I believe a permit system would actually interfere with responsible ORV management. First and foremost, installing an ORV permit in a park with the extremely large number of visitors as is the case of CAHA will be an extremely costly venture and will be very difficult to install, maintain and administer. The primary reason most permit systems are implemented is to both allow operation and then not allow operators that violate regulations, resulting in prevention of violations. Because of the wide open nature of CAHA, I do not believe a permit system will fulfill this reason without constant enforcement. An honest evaluation of the current system must reveal that the number one issue with regard to violations of ORV regulations is a dramatic lack of enforcement. A permit system in and of itself will add to this problem because even more enforcement is required for a permit system. My point is that the amount of additional enforcement needed because of the size of CAHA is extremely expensive. To add the enforcement needs of a permit system would be a financial burden that would not be realistic in today's financial reality. Some might argue that gated ramps would reduce the enforcement needs however this method would change the nature of the visitor experience to a degree that would ruin the visitor experience as well as cause a political issue with the local community who will not accept gates throughout their community. In addition, there is no question that a permit system will have some effect on local business because any cost related to the experience will increase the cost of a visit to the park and will no doubt be covered by visitors spending less at local businesses. It is for these and many other reasons that I suggest at least one management option be developed that avoids implementing a permit system.

##### May Be Effective

- until traffic becomes too much that it reduces the enjoyment of users

- The pedestrian user should wear a sticker on his or her shirt with colors such as red for weekly and blue for yearly. The yearly permit holders should also have one duplicate copy of the sticker in his or her wallet as well.

*(no selection)*

- you should permit folks we have them and we do not have a problem with paying for such a beautiful resource

**Not Effective**

- A permit system would allow for educating the ORV public, provide more funds for additional park management, and allow for more effective law enforcement.
- This encourages careless and criminal ORV access to the beach.
- Not consistent with other national Seashores.

**4.A.2 Establish a permit system for ORV use.**

**Definitely Effective**

- 3.A.24 would give the ability to revoke a permit, a good deterrent for users
- Make the permit easily obtained and include educational materials in the process.
- It seems only reasonable that ORV owners be officially 'permitted' to use the Resource; to be advised of their trust and responsibility; and to contribute to the preservation of the Resource.
- This will promote more responsible usage and provide revenue to help sustain the resource

**May Be Effective**

- Unlimited vs. limited number. Costs This will reduce beach use and create a class of haves vs. have nots. Also create lots of enforcement issues.
- Only if it is reasonably available and not burdensome to those that have been driving on the beach for decades.
- If you don't limit the number of permits issued or raise the price of a permit too high - if you do - only rich kids from families with inside connections will have them
- May help to add an avenue of information, if managed right the money could go to ramp/facility management. I still don't agree with a permit though.
- It may be time to establish a permit system as long as the money raised goes to improvements of the ORV system
- As long as it does not become a lottery for beach access, i.e., no limits on number of permits
- Not needed now, may be in future.
- If permits are required during peak seasons. I may limit the numbers that "just want to drive on the beach once" crowd.
- ORV users with years of experience follow the rules & abide by safety measures - most violators are those with little or no experience

- If established it should be of no cost or very minimal cost
- If a permit system were established I would hope that it would be as simple as the new fishing license was in 2007, with a nominal fee.
- only if warranted by consistently exceeding the carrying capacity
- I'd rather see a pass system.
- A safety permit system would allow random spot checks of each vehicle on the beach as the beach is patrolled and at time of permit purchase. This will minimize the burden of enforcement on the NPS.
- As long as the permits were available. If a quota is set for annual permits, then, this is not desirable. Otherwise, it would be a good, revenue generating, program. No quotas!
- If education is included along with required equipment check and cost is nominal with no limit on number of permits. Permit must be for operator and vehicle
- This may be effective, but I'm not certain it would. Having a permit would in effect enable some people to take an even more casual approach to driving on and enjoying our great resource. (ie..I paid to have a good time, I'm going to do what I want)
- A permit system should be instituted only after every other conceivable solution has been tried effectively and objectively demonstrated to have failed.
- Going to Portsmouth Island used to require a permit. I don't think any of us minded that.
- A permit system designed with a priority on low administration costs and aimed at increasing operator education along with being easily obtained by the park's visitors may be possible. Such a system if based on education could provide a way to instruct ORV operators on safe driving techniques, provide mitigation with regard to protected species laws and communicate in many ways with visitors to the park.

### **Not Effective**

- There is no need for a permit as long as there is staffing to enforce violations.
- I am totally against a permit system. This would lead to a limited number of permits being allowed thus denying access to some and allowing others.
- Unacceptable. This would further inhibit access. This fails to meet designation of Recreational area.
- NO. Permits do not indicate any level of competence nor willingness to comply with any regulations and only serves as a revenue source for the park system.
- No permits are required. They would greatly reduce access and would not fair to the public. An alternative may be however to require each ORV operator to belong to an association like NCBBA. This would allow education and peer pressure to be leveraged. If any type of permit system is implemented it would need to be based on low admin costs, high on operator education, and be easily obtained. There should not any type of limit on the number of permits. No first come first serve and no lotteries, etc.
- If a permit system is deployed, every Dare Co resident who wants one gets one. Are you going to punish me for moving here?
- No good. I guess talking about rights here would do no good. The residents of the islands would lose out on a drop in visitors.

- This would be very expensive and difficult to implement. Although it would not be an inconvenience to me I remember in the 1970s when permits were proposed and I was spending many weekends at Hatteras driving 330 miles each way what an inconvenience to drive all-night only to have to wait until 8 or 9 am to get a permit. One half of a weekend would be shot immediately.
- 4.A.2 The entire visiting population needs to be educated on resource protection and not just the ORV community. New signage at ramps and educational handouts at visitor centers, campgrounds, rental agencies, motels, lighthouses, retail stores etc. are needed. The 2007 list of violations (weekly resource reports) to resource closures shows that pedestrians are the number one violators by far. Larger signs at closures will help also. All NPS enforcement, NPS resource management, NC Marine Fishery, NPS volunteer entry into closures must be documented. This past summer (2007) I witnessed enforcement, and resource management (turtle and bird) violations of bird and turtle closures which are probably being charged to visitor violations, since no records are kept. Cable TV has been used by the NPS in the past and should be used again. Radio broadcasts on station 1610 would also help.
- Too many enforcement problems
- Most visitors come to Cape Hattaras for the feeling of freedom

#### **4.B. Permit Requirements (if a permit system is implemented)**

**4.B.1** Require permit applicants to watch an informational video before they are issued a permit. The video would provide education on Seashore resources and proper ORV driving techniques.

##### **Definitely Effective**

- May create big lines at permit issuing centers.

##### **May Be Effective**

- Only if offered on line. The permit must be obtainable without visiting OBX since many of the visitors come from so far away.
- The logistics and management would be tough, but I think some sort of literature or video would be good regardless of a permit
- If permits are required a video would help.
- Only if it available on the internet and part of an internet application.
- Provide this for visitors who need the knowledge but do not make it a requirement for everyone. Some of us have been driving the beach for 50 years.
- Never hurts to review, however those ORV users with multiple years of experience could help to write the script
- Allow applicants to apply on line by reviewing the video and taking an on line test.
- difficult to have due to size of park and numbers of ramps
- But, more likely beach driving rules provided and test administered before issuing permit more effective
- Only if there is enough locations to show the video.
- Would pedestrian visitors be required to watch video on Seashore resources also?
- Previous permit holders should only have to watch it for the first time

- At home with a computer, or library, or by US mail, and tackle shops if they are willing.
- I would question how this would work for out of state ORV users. I can purchase a fishing permit online. Will I be able to do the same with an ORV permit? If I drive to Hatteras on a Friday evening for a weekend can this be accomplished locally?
- I believe a well-designed and clearly understandable brochure should be sufficient instead of a video. Park staff issuing the permits should review the brochure with the user when the permit is purchased. The staff should have a list of items to go through with the user so that all staff convey the same information.

#### **Not Effective**

- This is heading way too far into over-regulation of a taxpayer owned resource. Just issue the permits - I don't have to watch a fishing video to get a NC license.
- Written information with a signature to prove it has been read would suffice.
- Would be long lines during the season
- Time consuming; visitors will bypass to spend more time on the beach
- rather see a test. don't make it a pain to get a permit.
- It is better to have this information widely available to all users, without a permit system. The people that choose not to use the resource in a proper manner are going to do so whether they have seen a video or not, and law enforcement is a better option to prevent abuse.
- Again..high costs of administration and unnecessary for the great majority of long-time users.
- Watching an informational video in itself would not be enough in itself to get an ORV permit.
- How would this work before a big holiday such as forth of July? Where would personnel come from to show the video? How much time does a vacationer have for this?
- Make 'em take a test like driving.
- If permit is necessary and mandated by NPS then the permit should be at the entrances of the seashore and be for all users of the park. The controversy that has brought the immediate need for a formal ORV plan is due to resource violations. Most of these violations have been by pedestrians and dogs and not ORV's therefore should a permit be required there should be no discrimination of users and all should be permitted.
- Education is good when and accepted by Park visitor. Handout reading, etc. Forced education to vacation will not fly. Tourism will fall and economy drop.

**4.B.2** Develop a “drivers test” that would be required before issuance of permit. The permit applicant would need to take this test after viewing a video either in person or on-line.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Works to a degree for road driving would do same for beach driving.

#### **May Be Effective**

- may be cost prohibitive
- That's going to be a nightmare to create & police - essepecially with short term visitors

- don't require people to watch a video. a short exam on essential information should suffice
- Okay in theory, but a horror to try to implement. Do not recommend trying. No one likes to be told they cannot drive safely—even when they cannot. Maybe make something available for first-timers on a voluntary basis.
- This is new ground not covered in any other park that allows ORV use. It would be time, cost and labor intensive. Perhaps a short written test vs. a "road test".
- A “drivers test” would be a step in the right direction, depending on the standards of the test.
- But could this be tied to a endorsement on their current drivers liscens.

### **Not Effective**

- Not sure what this accomplishes except to increase the cost and pain in the ass of the permit system.
- Completely unworkable.
- You have to take driver's test for your license and yet people do not follow all the applicable laws and regulations. I think this is only good in theory.
- Written information with a signature to prove it has been read would suffice.
- A driver test could be helpful but should be used to educate not deny usage.
- Too much beauracrcy and too expensive to implement. Give them a written exam.
- This is heading way too far into over-regulation of a taxpayer owned resource. Just issue the permits
- Would be long lines during the season
- It's not that difficult if people have 4 wheel drive, drop tire pressure. Northerners have experience in snow, which is similar.
- a logistical nightmare.
- Visitors come to the CHNS at all times of day and sometimes stay for just a weekend. Will the video and drivers test be available at 3 AM each day? Having a policing function with an educational element day and night as noted above is sufficient.
- Time consuming; visitors will bypass to spend more time on the beach. Visitors come to the beach to fish, sightsee etc; not take drivers tests.
- Not sure the cost of doing this would bring any benefits as they have to be drivers any ways.
- This is not realistic, and I doubt there are funds available to staff this type of operation. The end result of this would be many people who want to be on the beach being prevented for extended periods of time. I come from out of state, and spend a good deal of money in the local economy. If it turns out I have to wait for several days to see a video and then take a test as staff becomes available, I'm not going to travel. There are many of us that do travel in this manner and this type of system would help cripple the local economies.
- Huge waste of Park resources and tourist's time!!!Most applicants already have been to the beach with friends or family and have a knowledge of what to do
- Not a good idea. Too expensive, and useless

- I would question how this would work for out of state ORV users. I can purchase a fishing permit online. Will I be able to do the same with an ORV permit? If I drive to Hatteras on a Friday evening for a weekend can this be accomplished locally?
- Would this be a written test or driving test? If this is a driving test, it would not work. In the summer time or on weekends, the NPS would never be able to test all the visitors. This would be time consuming and costly. It would require additional park personnel and a testing site.
- Who would administer this test? How many could be done in an hour? 'You might need a staging area like at the Hatteras Ferry slip to handle the traffic.
- By default drivers should have vehicle operating skills by having a valid drivers license. If deemed absolutely necessary, should be for first time permit holders only.
- There would need to be a way to separate "seasoned" drivers from novices
- Driving tests are not an efficient method of ORV training because they require trained staff, are very expensive, limit times of day permits can be obtained, require visitors to use valuable recreation time to visit a specific location and are not easily administered to large numbers of park users.

**4.B.3** Provide a permit sticker that would be placed on the ORV bumper for annual permits, a mirror hanger for weekly permits. A visible permit on the vehicles would encourage peer pressure and reporting of non-permitted vehicles.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- But mirror tags for all - or at least the option. Some of us use alternate vehicles.
- Snitching, this isn't Philadelphia. Yeah, we'll do it. I drive 3 trucks, would I be able to get permit stickers for my trucks?
- Would like to see the sticker on the windshield, back glass or both. Not everyone wants a bumper sticker.
- Some sort of sticker is effective. A low cost vehicle mounted annual is good. Mirror hangers are ok but can too easily be stolen or blown away. A low tack window mounted week sticker may be more durable. Either way this would enhance peer pressure and make it easier for enforcement.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Why not a hanger for everyone so one could use multiple vehicles?
- If implemented I think these methods would work. I would not say bumper though due to racks for equipment may hinder view.
- May be effective if a permit system is necessary, provided that the permit is for the operator not the vehicle and that operator can have multiple stickers for multiple vehicles.
- Some users have more than one vehicle
- People are sensitive about bumper stickers since most new bumpers are made of plastic material. If a "bumper" sticker was required, allow for attachment in ways that won't
- The specific disadvantage of mirror hangers is that they can be stolen, sold, etc. It happens regularly with handicapped hangers. Weekly passes also sound a tad long. Daily would be better, though obviously more costly to administer.

- To differentiate between annual or weekly visitors not warranted. Mirror hangers might be effective but assigning permits to specific vehicle is not effective or convenient. Peer pressure is more effective, enforcement is more effective. Permits are not effective.
- Trouble would be for multi ORV's like myself. Would I get blanket coverage or would I have to purchase three? Mirror hangers would be effective for annual permits
- The permit should have an ID number associated to a particular driver.
- Weekly permits should be issuer for a two week period. They should be color coded with the dates in large numbers so the they are recognizable by anyone.
- There needs to be some type of a gate or queue to access the beach with an ORV.
- when fishing with tailgate down and rod holder on front bumper, might not see a bumper sticker. Might have to go on the windshield.
- A bumper sticker may be more effective
- How about a license plate on the front like Delaware does.

#### **Not Effective**

- This is heading way too far into over-regulation of a taxpayer owned resource. Just issue the permits
- Don't mess my bumper up-- tag in the window will work
- one permit for all types of users just change the color the preferred location would be a mirror hanger.
- No bumper stickers. Windshield stickers if necessary & ORV permits should be a system of last resort.
- A single annual permit system (if implemented) should be used for ease of enforcement.
- What happens if owner sells vehicle??
- Visitors should be more concerned with reporting reckless and irresponsible violations than checking on whether or not a vehicle has a sticker.
- Should a permit be needed then notice should be put at each ramp and only a free permit given out at NPS locations or downloaded similar to USFW permit in Pea Island,
- Peer pressure is effective. Permits are not effective If at all, mirror hanging is possibility. Taking into consideration the wind factor of losing the permit at the first open door. Assigning to a specific vehicle or operator is not practical.
- This would require the creation of significant infrastructure to manage the creation and distribution of stickers. The cost of managing similar sticker systems observed in other jurisdictions indicates that it needlessly adds to the cost of the overall permitting process. Further, stickers are simply not needed to implement a permit system since a variety of computer based management alternatives exist. For example, since last year, Virginia counties no longer require the use of stickers or physical tokening of any kind to ensuring compliance with personal property tax.

**4.B.4** Require all ORV permit holders to carry a signed copy of the rules and regulations while operating an ORV on the beach.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Just like a vehicle registration, will get rid of the "I didn't know" excuse
- Reinforcing good behavior.
- This would eliminate any excuses about not knowing the laws. This should apply to all visitors, even non beach drivers, especially the dog leash laws.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Here lies a problem, what if that copy is lost? Will the operator be fined or be refused usage.
- Require if able to download booklet or pick up at any NPS office. Tackle shops would support this if permit were like the USFW permit that is free and downloaded from the internet.
- Something laminated or plastic so if it gets wet it will not ruin it.
- This should be an automatic part of getting the sticker. This is commonly done at Island Beach Park in NJ and Fort Fisher State Park in NC

#### **Not Effective**

- Not necessary if a test has already been taken
- Too much bureaucracy as is.
- Not needed if we have the permit. It means we have read and know the rules.
- Make adherence to the rules a condition of the permit and yank it for serious violations.
- Requiring ORV permit holders to have a signed copy of the rules and regulations is a means to what ends? The people that choose to use the beach responsibly will do so whether this is required or not, those that do not follow proper behavior will do so whether they have some papers with them or not. Law Enforcement is the proper way to accomplish this, and not permitting and additional needless hurdles and impediments to responsible people that dearly enjoy the resource.
- Does not ensure they have read it and will follow the rules. Would be an enforcement headache with little benefit except to be a way to increase fines.
- Redundant, you get your permit and you are required to follow the rules.
- If they take a test to get the permit, who needs the extra baggage that will get left at home when packing for vacation.
- We do not have to carry a copy of DMV rules.
- Give information at the time of the permit purchase. The permit itself should prove that the applicant received the rules.

#### **4.B.5 Assign permit to the vehicle.**

##### **Definitely Effective**

- I'm not the only one who drives my ORV, and I prefer all drivers in my family to be able to drive it.
- Beach vehicle license/permit would likely boost effectiveness, and more so in combination with operator permits. Temporary and/or seasonal permits necessary for regulation.

- Definitely effective, but the permit should have the information of the permit holder in the event there is a violation.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Not fair to anyone with vehicle troubles or if you purchase a new vehicle mid year or permit life.
- If implemented in a safety permit capacity, ensure that vehicle is safe to be on the beach. (Carry proper equipment, doesn't leak fluids, etc). Driver must be accountable as well.
- Or at a minimum a licensed operator should be present in the vehicle.
- Not sure of current regulations, but would opt to match up same as insurance coverage does.

#### **Not Effective**

- It is the driver you are concerned with.
- I have more than one ORV that I use - sometimes its the small SUV and other times its the full sized pickup
- Many of us use more than one vehicle. We don't want to have to duplicate the permits just for this reason.
- too many problems with multiple vehicles, etc
- This only permits the vehicle and the driver that obtained the permit. Any other driver my drive the vehicle and they may not be trained in the proper beach driving procedures.
- This is what Assateague does. The permit is not transferrable.
- People not authorized to be on the beach can do so with this option
- Permit would have to be displayed on the vehicle but all of your prior qualifications apply to a driver not a vehicle A permitted driver would have to display permit on the vehicle he is driving..

#### **4.B.6 Assign permit to the operator.**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Seasonal or temporary operator's beaching driving permit in combination with driver's permit, but more likely to be more effective than vehicle permit alone.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Only if someone else can drive for the "operator" under their permit.
- If a permit system is the only alternative, and again I am totally against the permit system. It should be assigned to the operator since that operator may have multiple vehicles.
- Would seem to be better than the vehicle as would apply to any vehicle operated
- Not sure of current regulations, but would opt to match up same as insurance coverage does.
- Certification as an ORV operator INSTEAD of Permit.

#### **Not Effective**

- Would require too many stops to enforce
- Vehicles get permit not operators
- Too much incentive to trade, sell, or steal, above all when they actually become valuable because their number is ultimately limited—or may be limited now at some locations or at some times of the year.
- I do not feel this would work nor is necessary. The current rules and regulations are adequate. It is a simple matter of education, enforcement, and getting the fines raised to be a deterrent. Perhaps a stakeholder organization should be required instead of a permit. The stakeholder organization could leverage peer pressure and the prerequisites for joining the organization could administrate the education.
- Too restrictive and could disqualify a non-drinking driver when needed
- In most cases the vehicle and the operator are the same, however, vehicles don't cause issues but drivers do. A possible solution would be give the driver a wallet card permit and return again to the mirror hanger vehicle display which could be taken with the operator.
- Sometimes another person will drive my ORV on the beach. Permit should go with the ORV. No one should be allowed to operate an ORV who does not have a valid drivers license. Holder of the permit is responsible for all fines, etc.

#### **4.C. Permit Distribution (if a permit system is implemented)**

**4.C.1** Issue permits only at NPS offices to ensure completion of education component.

##### **Definitely Effective**

- Think this is the right approach but perhaps for the wrong reason. NPS control of permits is necessary.
- Or at designated facility. Permit may be renewed by mail every 5 years with a good (no infractions) driving record.
- Effective, but where are you going to put the lines waiting for permits to be issued.

##### **May Be Effective**

- Only if drivers test are mandatory, otherwise I think it should be like a fishing license.
- issue through NPS offices. have an on-line test to qualify
- May be able to be web based as well. Allows for tracking of the educational portion.

##### **Not Effective**

- Too big a bottleneck
- Unworkable.
- This would require staffing 24 hours a day, and be cost prohibitive
- Too difficult for applicants and the NPS.
- There should be more options if a permit system is implemented.

- Skip the education component altogether. Enforce the important existing rules, but don't make more of them so as to play "gotcha" with the ORV driving taxpayers who also happen to share ownership of the resource.
- Would be long lines during the season
- Going to be difficult to cover unless have more offices & personnel
- People arrive at all times and it would need to be open 24/7 in addition there would be back-up at the various locations and not enough locations.
- As stated above, permits much be available on-line.
- Not necessary. As stated earlier, even if funding is made available, this will likely result in significant delays for people that want to enjoy this area. Signage can accomplish the same result without unnecessary restrictions. Permits accomplish no benefit to the area, and will result in significant detrimental economical impact to the local communities that need people like myself to choose to visit and contribute. If permits and regulations like this are implemented, I will choose to continue to visit.
- This would be impractical and not effective. The number of visitors, arriving 24/7 would require this to be full time 24/7 operation with unnecessary costs and overheads. NPS staffing would have to increase and there is no value added. Imagine traffic congestion in and out, as well as the lines to get the permit. Even if kiosks are used they would not be effective. Think of the congestion in airports for an analogy. This would be frustrating for operators, as well as the visitors. It would chaotic and public safety from the traffic is impacted. Also many of the NPS offices would have to be expanded for the peak summer season.
- The first issue of permits will be for Dare Co residents, carry a signed copy. All the rest, basically the same way. Visitors arrive 24/7 you are not equipped for that.
- This will "encourage " the out of state fisherman who comes on a Friday evening to try to break the rules as he may not be able to comply "during business hours".
- Best option: NO PERMITS! However, if required, NPS office distribution would not be effective. The number of Park visitors arriving at all hours would require a heavily manned 34-hour operation at multiple locations which is not feasible due to NPS funding and staffing constraints. Factor in lines of traffic, wait times, and other frustrating factors and you have a chaotic and potentially volatile situation.
- Not practicable. Weren't there over 1000 vehicles last forth of July. How could NPS offices possibly handle even one fourth of this number?
- Must hire too many people to staff a 24-hour permit office. Also this could not handle the weekend crowds.
- Too difficult with technology today you could do everything including video online and have it be cost effective and an effective tool.

**4.C.2** Make permits readily available through tackle shops, other businesses, NPS offices, and/or the Outer Banks Visitors Bureau or other welcome centers.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Not sure how the education thing is tied in here.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Still likely to be a logjam.
- Not fair to impose this on businesses - they have enough pressures. Visitors bureaus or welcome centers ok. And maybe tackle shops - but ask them!

- Once again this is not necessary. This would be frustrating to shop owners not to mention the visitors. The implementation of the new salt water fishing license is a prime example of this. Visitors come to the area to relax not wait in lines. However, having permits at decentralized areas would be necessary for those visitors who do not have internet access.
- Could help distribute administrative load and crowds
- If it is implemented in an educational format and not a safety format.
- Permits, if required, need to be available through several channels. Internet would be a good possibility maximizing availability and minimizing cost to implementation. Plus collection of demographic info. No fee for permit is preferred. Would also need to be available locally at walk-in locations, NOT at newly established kiosks or offices dedicated to just that function with limited hours of operation.

#### **Not Effective**

- can't insure that applicant knows what's needed
- May work for lotteries, but unless individuals win a permit from a limited number, no NPS control is built in.
- Almost impossible to effectively control their number. The responsibility belong to NPS and ought not be delegated or shared by local businesses who have self-serving reasons to violate the rules of the game. E.g. counterfeiting permits or scalping them when they become scarce—which they will do eventually.
- Tackle shops and other businesses are busy
- Except for NPS offices, others may undermine the purpose of the management plan and invite fraud.

#### **4.C.3 Make permits available on-line.**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- These will be carried by the driver & a sticker on the ORV.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Perhaps could be effect if monitored by NPS or NPS contractor with limits in numbers and distribution.
- But where/when would you see educational materials or take instructional training.
- If permits are required they must be available on line. An educational process must proceed the on line purchase which says “I have seen and agree to abide by .....

#### **Not Effective**

- Too many people still do not have access to computers and on line sources. Too difficult to control the number of permits and especially if permits are to be limited to specific areas or times
- Applicants should be required to make an in-person appearance at an NPS office.
- Only for renewal

#### **(No Selection)**

- If we're going to go this D\*\*\* permit route, make them available on-line so we won't have to stand in line on our vacations wasting our time to be permitted to do something we have been doing .

**4.C.4** Use the North Carolina saltwater fishing license system as a model for distributing ORV permits.

**Definitely Effective**

- Seems to have worked well.
- I certainly hope that a permit system is not developed but if it is this would be the best way for out of state visitors to access the permits.

**May Be Effective**

- I am a lifetime sportsman license holder, that insured that I would not have to buy the license so I can't say that I have seen the effect of that system yet.
- As long as more than one type of permit is available. ie 1 week/ month/ or 1 year.
- This is the best model presented here, however the NC SWFL is frustrating as well.
- The tackle shops lose money helping customers complete the applications now, what will you do to improve this with your plan?
- Might cut down having to design a new delivery system.

**Not Effective**

- Private businesses may undermine the purpose of the management plan and encourage fraud.
- In Delaware you may not be on the beach with an ORV unless you are actively fishing. This denies access to other beach users/

**4.C.5** Develop a computer-administered system for ORV permitting that allows the NPS to gather demographic information on permit buyers.

**Definitely Effective**

- As much as I hate to admit, data mining can help.
- But put restrictions on how this info is used and who has access to it.
- If this becomes a reality, tracking is a must. Real figures over time are of the utmost value both to the Seashore and it's neighbors.

**May Be Effective**

- Yes. This would be good for collecting the information. But how would the info be used. More marketing by the tourist's bureau.
- Again, I don't think that permits will solve anything. If, unfortunately, they are they must be READILY available. The internet is by far the best option with tackle shops being effective as well. Any other type of distribution is inevitably going to cause unnecessary delays, hassles, and confusion which is precisely what people come here to avoid.
- Not answering the demographics shouldn't disallow the permit, it should be a choice.

**Not Effective**

- Invasion of privacy.
- Permits are not needed and are a means to no end other than to require a permit. This demographic information will be skewed because if many of the rules and restrictions suggested in this document are enacted, my demographic will be choosing to go elsewhere, and the local economies will be ruined.
- In-person appearances should be mandatory to avoid fraud.
- Funds would better spent on additional Law Enforcement Rangers

#### 4.C.6 Construct a system of kiosk stations that issue ORV permits.

##### **May Be Effective**

- If permits are only that, a permit with some general information and guidelines.
- I think tackle shops, visitor centers and other businesses on the seashore would be better informed and run that a kiosk in some strip mall in Raleigh
- Would the resources generated support such a system?
- Would the kiosk attendant be able to spot-check for equipment and unsuitable vehicles, and enforce compliance?
- If staffed 7 days a week with extensive hours

##### **Not Effective**

- Too big a bottleneck
- They will be overwhelmed.
- And it would be expensive. There are easier and more cost effective ways.
- too expensive do it online
- Favors locals and no upper limitation to numbers.
- In-person appearances should be mandatory to avoid fraud.
- Too restrictive and a real bottleneck. I may be coming down at night first time and want to go straight to the beach to fish.
- They should be issued in person, with the vehicle to be permitted. This way the issuing agent can affix the permit directly to the vehicle.
- Horrible idea. Remember, keep the culture of the park in place. Just a horrible idea. Let the local business issue the permits as the fishing license is issued I should be able to buy my license and get my permit at the same time from the same business that is willing to sell the license and permit. There will be plenty of local businesses willing to do this.

##### **(no selection)**

- Very costly

#### **4.D. Permit Fees and Types (if a permit system is implemented)**

#### 4.D.1 Issue only annual permits.

##### **Definitely Effective**

- Ease of enforcement. Based on other beaches, short term permit buyers are the ones who tear up the beach in comparison.
- For Dare Co residents, and all that want them. Some of us would like to have multi-year permits.
- For residents only.
- Senior citizens should have a life time permit with no annual fee

##### **May Be Effective**

- If it is no charge this would be the way to go
- If endangered species range and habitat protection require significant reduction of beach driving limited numbers of season prescribed annual permits may be necessary.
- 2 years better
- Be able to renew year to year without testing again. Make it an annual permit fee for 12 months. Do not make exceptions. It is what it is and if people want it they can pay for it. I am out of state and come down a few weeks a year from PA. I feel this attitude will keep problems down. I will keep money coming in to enforce the laws of off road driving.
- Should follow the NC saltwater license rules. NC resident and non-resident rates. 3 day, two week and annual rates.

##### **Not Effective**

- Only applicable to frequent visitors and residents.
- This would deter vacationers from enjoying the ORV access if it is a pay permit.
- Users need the option for shorter periods
- I prefer an annual permit as I am in the Seashore and on the beach 6-10 times per year, but it would unfairly penalize the user who gets to CHNS only once a year for a week
- Many many one time visitors
- This would appear to be an attitude issue of discouraging visitors to HI. Would not protect and preserve the cultural resources
- Terrible idea. There are many people who come for an annual vacation only.
- Short term visitors will have a conniption fit!
- the majority of the orv use is in the 1-2 week range
- There are too many people who visit for a week only. Annual might work if provided at no fee.

- Permits should be based on duration of use. The more you use the beach as a highway, the more you should pay for the privilege.
- Should be patterned after NC hunting license options. Might not be able to charge more for out of state.
- Permit system should include shorter duration and lower cost permits for ORV visitors especially non-NC residents.

#### 4.D.2 Issue both annual and two-week permits.

##### **Definitely Effective**

- If there is a minimal charge then you have to make it available for both annual and the a shorter duration the same as the NC Fishing License.
- The 2 week have to be for 14 days
- For absentee property owners and visitors.

##### **May Be Effective**

- If a permit system becomes necessary, users need the option for annual, two week and even lifetime.
- Add 1 week permit for vacationers.
- Should make available annual, two-week and daily permits.
- May provide more flexibility control and increased species management effectiveness.
- Annual, two week, one week, and even 1-3 days would be required.
- 2 years and 1 month better
- Why not issue multi-year permits or permits that do not expire?

##### **Not Effective**

- It sounds as if you've decided to issue annual permits and it's only a question about whether there are others. May be okay now, but as use grows it will pose major problems when it may be necessary to limit permits to days only or maybe one week.
- Permits should be based on duration of use.
- If a permit is issued it should be available to pedestrians on a two week basis. The ORV user should be permitted only yearly so as not to add confusion to the process of ticketing by NPS officer
- Let the user decide how long the permit lasts and it's starting and ending dates. This would allow users to cover the entire period of their trip or multiple trips at their option. Administrative cost differences for this if implemented via a web based system are zero

#### 4.D.3 Do not charge a permit fee.

##### **Definitely Effective**

- Not likely. Where will the funds to administer the system come from?
- This is the "people's land". Everyone should have access

- is the national park not receiving tax money?

### **May Be Effective**

- It depends on what the revenue would go to.
- This is the problem with a permit system, I haven't heard of one yet that doesn't charge a fee.
- I cannot imagine why you would add an administrative load to the NPS' workset without also adding a fee to pay for it.
- There is a cost to a permit program. Users should pay the cost.
- I don't think anyone would mind a fee to cover the expense as long as it is reasonable.
- For current residents with 10 or more years as full time residents for both Hyde and Dare County, issue a free life time permit.

### **Not Effective**

- Can not pay for all of the programs that will be needed to maintain the permit system
- If a permit is issued there should be a fee attached.
- If you do it you have charge for it. A fee structure similar to the fishing license would be appropriate.
- If one pays they're more likely to adhere to rules & regulations
- doesn't provide money for user services, enforcement and administration
- It will be controversial enough to install any permit system, without also introducing the element of a fee. I recommend against it, even if all or part of the money is to stay at the park. It is also an added administrative headache to collect and account for the money.
- Doesn't comply with Federal Regulations. Enforcement costs must be covered.
- if the goal is to utilize revenue for maintenance/improvement of HI
- Permits will cost money to implement. Destitute Dare Co residents that need a permit should have a way to get them.
- Fees discourage casual, careless and criminal use of the national seashore.
- ORV management is going to cost the NPS a lot of money. The visitors that elect to participate in that privilege should pay for it.
- Heaven forbid, it happens but if and when a permit system in installed there must be some means to pay for it as well as enforcement. I just worry about costs once a system is established. Reports I have heard from locations where there is a permit is that charges continue to increase far beyond the original concept.
- Permit fees would be a large source of revenue, as long as the revenues were used strictly for the park.

#### **4.D.4 Charge a permit fee based on duration of permit.**

### **Definitely Effective**

- It would be fair.
- If a fee is imposed, then this would make sense and it would be more equitable than a single fee.
- Like fishing permits, users are going to want to know where these monies are going
- The later in the year a permit is issued the less it should cost. The 2 week should not change, no matter what time of year. Or even a permit that is one week in each of 2 years, consecutive weeks.
- Offer a lifetime permit to senior citizens over 65 for a nominal fee. This permit would be issued to the person. This could be similar to the NC salt water fishing license, except not only for NC residents but NC non-resident property owners.
- Fees should be commensurate to the cost of providing all the costs associated with ORV management.
- Permit cost to duration time scale needs to be appropriate. For example, \$20 dollars for two weeks or \$60 dollars per year.
- Offer a lifetime permit to senior citizens over 65 for a nominal fee. This permit would be issued to the person. This could be similar to the NC salt water fishing license, except not only for NC residents but NC non-resident property owners.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Same as 4.D.3 , but if there is a charge obviously there should be a price difference
- This is the problem with a permit system, I haven't heard of one yet that doesn't charge a fee.
- Without too many duration period options
- The permit charge should be based on the duration. However, I would recommend that the shorter term permits be priced higher and a price break is levied for the annual permit.
- only if the fee is very reasonable and goes totally towards "The Beach" in some way

#### **Not Effective**

- Would require a too many different types of permits, Many people come once or twice at different times of the year
- I would be in favor of a permit fee ONLY if it is used specifically for administering to THIS PROGRAM. If this was to be put in any kind of general fund, I am highly against fees.
- Cost should be flat since CHNSRA offers no ORV facilities.
- We have day visitors, weekend visitors, week visitors and multi time visitors that will require various permits to be necessary. With this said the only cost permit acceptable would be one that is set up at park entrances and charges all users of the park. We have day visitors, weekend visitors, week visitors and multi time visitors that will require various permits to be necessary. The "Golden Park Pass" would suffice to satisfy this requirement too.

#### **(No Selection)**

- For not resident property owners and visitors fee based on duration of permit.

**4.D.5** Establish fee permits for congested areas only; ORV users of "non-congested areas" would obtain free permits.

### **May Be Effective**

- May help to spread the use of areas.
- This may cause confusion as to where they need a permit and where they don't, when I use the seashore it could be anywhere from Oregon Inlet to Ocracoke Inlet.
- may work, but may push people to non-conjected areas, that then become congested.
- If congested areas include pedestrian beach areas, no. If congested areas means high numbers of ORVs at fishing hot spots, what does "high numbers mean? And free permits adds incentive for increased vehicle use and resource impacts.

### **Not Effective**

- Why should only the wealthy be able to use these areas?
- Too confusing.
- Most of us use more than one area. This seems like it would be an administrative nightmare.
- A plan that covers the entire area will have greater impact
- This is not manageable as it would require on-going administration and policing for multiple areas
- Unfair...either all or none....and again, it should be based on monies only being used for administration of this program
- This could be difficult to enforce. The system should be simple.
- Maybe okay to start with, but the day will come when there will be few non-congested areas. I recommend against any and all fees, except perhaps a basic park entrance fee and dashboard "ticket."
- There is low value benefit for this and would make misunderstanding more frequent and enforcement would be challenged. If they idea is to pay higher for congested areas so that would only encourage folks to go somewhere else. The number of visitors, arriving 24/7 would require this to be full time 24/7 operation with unnecessary costs and overheads. NPS staffing would have to increase and there is no value added. Imagine traffic congestion in and out, as well as the lines to get the permit
- Should be standardize either free or fee.
- Should be the whole beach.
- Everybody who comes to the Park goes to the Point & Hatteras Inlet & Oregon Inlet, if for nothing else, just to do it. For many it is a "rite of passage"
- That's like having a fishing permit for fishing where tewhere the fish are, and don't charge if there no fish.
- Needs uniformity or non-permit areas will become congested
- Would almost have to set up gates like at parking garages to manage this.
- Not feasible, effective, or highly unacceptable. This would create a one/one off system as on Assateague Island.

- This distinction between congested and non-congested could be open to criticism for it being too arbitrary. The fees should apply to all ORV areas.

#### **4.D.6 Base permit fees on “cost recovery” for administering and distributing the permits.**

##### **Definitely Effective**

- Helps with Federal compliance
- Only if disclosure of income and expenditures are available to the general public.

##### **May Be Effective**

- May result in high cost which would be detrimental.
- If a permit system is put in place the cost should only cover the administration and distribution.
- should also help fund enforcement
- Could work depending on implementation of permit system, however all visitors should then be required to participate in "cost recovery" to support the Park
- May be effective if costs are disclosed to public
- First year would have no data for comparison. How would you refund year 1 if you overcharge for “cost of recovery.”
- Agreed, yet permit cost needs to be capped to preclude permits becoming cost prohibitive and/or excessive (>\$100 per permit).

##### **Not Effective**

- That would be open ended.
- This only would be "paperwork". If you have to pay make it count and generate revenue to better the resource.
- Not fair to permit holders.
- Costs need to be covered however extra monies should be designated to maintain ramps, provide more signage, rest room facilities, etc
- Monetary base rather than resource management and protection based
- This does not reflect the true cost of administering the management plan.
- “Cost recovery” is at best a specious measure which will almost certainly engender ever increasing floor levels of costs as overhead increases with time. “Should cost” would be a better methodology.

#### **4.D.7 Base permit fees on “cost recovery” for administering the entire ORV management program including additional ranger vehicles, research to establish carrying capacity standards and indicators, research on the effects of ORVs, monitoring, additional and improved fish cleaning stations, or any other element included in an ORV management plan.**

##### **Definitely Effective**

- I would like it that if I bought the NPS annual park entrance pass (that I have used in Colorado to get into Rocky Mountain National Park and Mesa Verde National Park), I would automatically be put into the ORV access permit database and my NPS park pass would be my ORV permit. Don't know how this works with my view on

issuing the ORV permit to a vehicle rather than a user/driver, but I shouldn't have to pay twice for access to the Seashore beaches.

- There would be more value added if this is done. However, the burden of good management would be placed on the NPS. If the cost is too high then this would act as a deterrent to the visitor and would result in less visits and would have an economic impact on the area.
- Helps with Federal compliance
- Have SEVERE reservations about limiting the vehicles. During good fishing times the Point can really get congested with no complaints by anyone and everyone has good time. How can we tell a family from Ohio that there is no room when they drove eighteen hours to get there just on a chance to catch the fish of a lifetime. They may come three or four times a year and put a lot of money into the local economy. Yes I know there are other places other than the Point, but that place truly is special!!
- I like this better than 4d6
- Factor in the cost of resource management attributed to ORV use.

### **May Be Effective**

- this may be too high. NPS has many of these responsibilities now
- The fee should be based cost recovery of the permit and administration and the incremental portion of the ORV management program and no more. If for some strange reason the cost recovery generates a surplus additional fish cleaning stations can be built at locations that do not currently have them.
- I get a bit paranoid about some of the wording in here. "Researching carrying capacities, effects of ORV's" and etc. As long as this is used as scientific impacts and not as a hammer to prove limits or access limitations should be implemented. Included in here should be "all user research" since ALL human usage has an impact. The way this is worded smacks of looking specifically at ONE user group.
- fines collected to go in same fund; all fees collected should stay in the park or be done away with people would like to see their money working here
- If implemented, should include all visitors, not just ORV operators
- There will be huge "startup" costs, this will have to be spread out for several(many) years.
- The permit fee needs to be reasonable or this is a "TAX" on a very select group which will engender a legal response.
- After you get 2-3 years of data this would be feasible.
- This is too all- inclusive. The research factor and the fish cleaning stations should have nothing to do with a permit to access the seashore in a vehicle.
- Again annual permit cost needs to be capped (\$100 dollars max) as expecting the ORV user group to cover all program expenses is unreasonable.
- Included in cost should be resource management also. ORV has a tremendous impact. The Executive Order issued by President Carter requires on-going monitoring to ensure the ORV plans is not impacting wildlife and natural resources. That must be part of the cost of doing business for the park.

### **Not Effective**

- The cost would be prohibitive and not fairly allocated to all users

- There would be no incentive to holding down costs.
- Not fair to permit holders.
- unfair, this places the entire burden on the ORV users, who historically have had free access to the park for their recreational use, not on the other parties trying to close down and prevent access to the beaches.
- This is the same problem that I see with the saltwater license, those funds will be used improperly as they have been so far with the fishing license.
- We already pay our taxes for gov't programs. With everything listed here, the price of a permit would be outrageous
- This is a hassle the NSP does not need--for with it comes the requirement of an audit to ensure that operating efficiently. Would not protect and preserve the cultural resources
- This would make the cost of the permit quite high and probably out of the reach of many. Remember the National Seashore is owned by the people the government is only the steward of the resource.
- Unsatisfactory because no upper ceiling of acceptable impact is indicated.
- I do not think it is altogether fair to heap all these costs on one set of users. Everyone benefits from ORV management, including non-ORV users.
- Research should be funded separately and be part of larger global study related to HI long-range planning
- This should be born on the entire system as it is our resource not only for ORV but species protection, passive use etc.
- If permit system is put into place, the federal government should fund any and all improvements and requirements. A government controlled "cost recovery" program could possibly get out of hand. If a permit system is implemented, the funds from the fees should be placed in a separate account and not a general fund account. These funds should be monitored and distributed by a selected number of members of the CHNS Negotiated Rulemaking Board and not by government officials.
- Rather see funds from fishing license even if it means raising the cost per license
- Apparently uses for this fund are already identified. My suggestion is that these items be delineated in current budget needs of NPS.
- Government carries some of that burden
- It would only be excellent for "cost recovery" of pedestrian usage ie education of the pedestrian to closures that he or she may harm when enjoying his or her recreation in the park.
- It would only be excellent for "cost recovery" of pedestrian usage ie education of the pedestrian to closures that he or she may harm when enjoying his or her recreation in the park.
- A government controlled "cost recovery" program could possibly get out of hand. If a permit system is implemented, the funds from the fees should be placed in a separate account and not a general fund account. These funds should be monitored and distributed by a selected number of members of the CHNS Negotiated Rulemaking Board and not by government officials.

**4.D.8** Adjust permit fees periodically (e.g., every 3 years) based on administrative costs.

**May Be Effective**

- That is normal for items of this nature. Much like fishing licenses.
- That's pretty much a given if a permit system is required, but it should be kept in mind that all users are not financially equal and if this permit system is put into place it may eliminate many because they will no longer be able to afford it.
- five years would be more effective.
- Adjustment for fee administration should provided for as long there are audits of the fund revenues and expenses.
- Again, as long as user fees are only used for administration of this program and not in a general fund.
- 5 - 7 years
- Helps with Federal compliance
- We do not need to turn this into a for profit program.

#### **Not Effective**

- Raising the permit cost is detrimental to the ORV users but will happen.
- Not resource protection based – eg. Irrelevant to mandate.
- Needs an annual review of costs to determine fee base.
- Another blank check Why not six months or six years There may be future needs to adjust but please show some early restraint If a case can be made for increases O.K review perhaps on a minimum 3 year period but as this reads it seems to call for an automatic 3 year increase.
- Use NC hunting license procedures as a guide.
- Have the fees same as NC license fee. (Meaning the same dollar fees charged based on time of permit) Adjust as NC saltwater license fee is adjusted. Or, no adjustments allowed for 3 years from date of change. Annual fee increases, are bi-annual would not be acceptable to me.

#### **4.E. Permit Quantity (if a permit system is implemented)**

**4.E.1** Issue an unlimited number of permits Note: Site specific capacity limits on the number of vehicles in congested areas could apply (see option 4.E.3).

#### **Definitely Effective**

- The business at the beach would collapse if people could not get a permit. They would not visit.
- This would be the most effective. No limit on the number of permits. Limiting the number of permits for a congested areas in not desired or necessary.
- Model after color coding of Dare County Re-entry Permits. Give high use areas a specific color. Multiple plastic color coded self cling permit stickers could be issued.
- PERMITS SHOULD ONLY HELP PARK SERVICE'S RECORD KEEPING ON PARK USE.

#### **May Be Effective**

- There should be no limit on the number of permits unless an audit is conducted by independent accounting firm, paid for by the Park Service and the result made public concludes that limits are needed.
- Any capacity limit must be absolutely necessary and uniformly administered based on clearly defined parking limitation criteria.

#### **Not Effective**

- A permit has to grant access to the entire park not just specific areas or limits in areas.
- Too complex to manage effectively; no upper limit and ignores resource protection requirements; no definition of “congested”
- Never begin with **anything** “unlimited.” The day will come, probably sooner rather than later, when limits will be essential. Even using the term “unlimited” sets expectations it will one day not be possible to meet.
- What would be more effective is managing the vehicles and fishermen that like to park and fish where the beach is narrow, such as just south of ramp 4 and the narrow area where the turtle nest was at 44. There are several spots between 23-34 that are narrow and easily blocked. The fishermen tend to not mind a crowd, as long as no one is being stupid, that becomes contagious.
- Very hard to manage. What's to prevent me from getting a permit for Buxton and then driving to Rodanthe? Do I have to buy a permit for each Village, each ramp #? If I go on a given ramp then I can't leave except at that ramp?
- This would destroy the natural resources of the CHNS.

#### **4.E.2 Limit the total number of permits issued.**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Eventually must be done (if not overdue, depending on scientific data and in compliance with NPS mandate)
- The problem will be to set the working number. One possibility is to “cap” the permits at today’s use—if that number can even be discovered. It probably also ought to vary by season and the state of closures for safety or resource reasons.

#### **May Be Effective**

- It's a national seashore and I don't think limiting the number of permits would accomplish anything.
- may need to limit to maintain carrying capacity

#### **Not Effective**

- Benefits some at the expense of others. Will reduce the number of tourists and adversely impact business base
- This could never be fair and the exact reason that I am completely opposed to a permit system.
- It would ruin people's vacations
- I have been supporting the businesses on the outer banks for 41 years and I'm too old now to wait in a line for 2 days to try to be one of the lucky ones who gets a permit
- This seems very unfair - this is a national park - it should be open to all.

- Imagine coming to the seashore for a week with the family, spending \$5000 and finding out cannot drive on the beach because there is a limit. Would not protect and preserve the cultural resources
- not fair. Just because one has a 2 week permit they may not spend all their time on the beach. People will move to areas less congestion on their own without government assistance
- Park visitors come from all part of the USA at different times of the year. Permits need to be issued so that all visitors from any user group may enjoy the park at any time of the year.
- number of permits issued during the year doesn't mean they're all there at the same time
- Should be first come first serve.
- This area can hold huge numbers of ORVs. Arriving at a set number is not the way.
- Very hard to manage. What's to prevent me from getting a permit for Buxton and then driving to Rodanthe? Do I have to buy a permit for each Village, each ramp #? If I go on a given ramp then I can't leave except at that ramp?
- Some people will get a 1 year permit, but only visit for 2 weeks because their vacation time may change or they hope to make more than 1 visit. If a finite number is issued, some will think have to get the permit, and yet never use it. This would deny someone who could use it the option to go ORV'ing.
- As I have previously stated the crowd in any one place tends to limit itself. Witness July 4 at ramp 49 ( or any other ramp). As the day wears on one must drive further and further away from the ramp to find a place to park aTo dater II have always been able to find open beach. If I didn't, permit or not I would go somewhere else, and if that was not possible I would give up for the day, As it is I don't frequent the seashore on big holidays due to crowding.
- I do not see the value. How do we know how many permitted ORVs are going to be anywhere at one time?
- Do not limit permit issuance. Instead limit number of vehicles on the beach in congested areas during the summer season as needed.

**4.E.3** Limit the number of vehicles on the beach, such as in congested areas, at any one time instead of limiting the number of permits issued.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Try to have it both ways. No matter which criterion is used, one day limits will be necessary—probably within the life of the new regulations
- Some people will get a 1 year permit, but only visit for 2 weeks because their vacation time may change or they hope to make more than 1 visit. If a finite number is issued, some will think have to get the permit, and yet never use it. This would deny someone who could use it the option to go ORV'ing.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Better alternative to total number of permits.
- must come to consensus with users about limits
- Use time weighted averaging, on a 24 hour basis.
- I prefer more secluded areas myself but if may be easier to monitor the problem makers without area limits. Many seem to like to congregate in the congested areas.

### **Not Effective**

- Congestion is self limiting. Advising of number already using area at entry point will allow operator to decide if he wants to go elsewhere or put up with congestion.
- I have not seen any evidence that problems are caused by the number of vehicles on the beach at any one time.
- I am against any denial of use.
- Who monitors and decides who stays and who goes.
- Who sets the number on vehicles and if the fish are running, who's going to stand at the ramp a tell a fisherman he can't fish because there is a limited number of 20 x 20 parking slots on the beach
- not fair. Just because one has a 2 week permit they may not spend all their time on the beach. People will move to areas less congestion on their own without government assistance
- Appears to increase confrontations, complicate enforcement and increase misunderstanding and resentments.
- This is not the right idea. The Point can hold thousands of ORVs and not be crowded. At spots between 23 & 34 three trucks can block the beach. One person on a towel can block passage at high tide.
- If vehicles are limited at a given ramp what is to prevent my going to the next ramp and driving the beach to get back to the 1st ramp area?
- This system is used on Assateague island and is a nightmare. Visitors could conceivably spend their day at the beach in line.
- Not enforceable. If too many ORVs are consistently in one place, it means that other places are flooded or closed.

#### **4.E.4 Issue permits for Seashore-wide access.**

### **Definitely Effective**

- If a permit system is put in place the permit should include all areas.
- Most people use many different areas.
- Fish swim where they swim. Fishermen will go to where the fish are. It would be wrong to have to get several permits just to fish where the fish are
- Model after color coding of Dare County Re-entry Permits. Give high use areas a specific color. Multiple plastic color coded self cling permit stickers could be issued.

### **Not Effective**

- Does not recognize limits required for endangered species seasonal sensitivity or NPS statutory mandates.
- The entire CHNS should not be accessible by any private ORVs.
- How can it be seashore wide access if there will areas not granted access due to wildlife.

#### **4.E.5 Issue permits for site-specific access.**

### **Definitely Effective**

- Model after color coding of Dare County Re-entry Permits. Give high use areas a specific color. Multiple plastic color coded self cling permit stickers could be issued.

#### **May Be Effective**

- For temporary closure areas in front of towns only. General beach access should have no permit or inhibition other than drivers license.
- If manageable and ceilings applied, with enforcement consistent and species requirements respected, might work
- This may work depending on the site.

#### **Not Effective**

- Fishermen constantly change their location and it would be burdensome to have multiple permits.
- Would be a enforcement nightmare
- This would become too complex.
- Permits should be for the entire seashore.
- Locals and regular visitors would need multiple permits.
- Users should have access to entire area & not be nicked & dimed for site specific areas in addition to their initial permit
- A permit has to grant access to the entire park not just specific areas or limits in areas.
- hinders movement a flexibility of users. many fish miles of the seashore in a day
- How many tags wil an operator need? Creates more problems that it solves.
- If a permit were to be issued for both ORVs and pedestrians, the pedestrian would be the only one that “site specific access” would apply to, as ORV operators would only have access through corridors drawn around closures, and their only access would be as a pedestrian from his or her vehicle.
- ABSOLUTELY NOT! Conditions change hourly sometimes! The Ocean may be rough on the northern beaches part of the day and the wind can change and it could become calm on the north side and rough on the southside

**4.E.6** Apply limits on numbers of permits or vehicles only to congested areas (e.g., spits and Cape Point). Areas would be managed adaptively so if visitation at currently non-congested areas increased, these areas could be added.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Model after color coding of Dare County Re-entry Permits. Give high use areas a specific color. Multiple plastic color coded self cling permit stickers could be issued.

#### **May Be Effective**

- this may be workable- need consensus on limits

#### **Not Effective**

- Congestion is self limiting. Advising of number already using area at entry point will allow operator to decide if he wants to go elsewhere or put up with congestion.

- The number of vehicles is now self regulated.
- One permit for entire seashore
- Too complex and would be more management than needed.
- I do not agree with denying usage. This is a National Recreational Seashore.
- Too complicated
- Once an area is permitted, no matter what the numbers are, it will be essentially impossible to lower that number in the future. Do not go there.
- Permits are not needed and are a means to no end other than to require a permit. This illustrates the true mission of requiring permits, and opponents of ORV use, have less people enjoy the resource. People that choose to enjoy areas that are congested shouldn't be prohibited from doing so. It is not preferable that an entity that likely does not choose to travel to congested areas, make that decision for them. This would harm the local economy. The areas are congested for a reason, and visitation at non-congested areas would not increase.
- Preventing traffic congestion at narrow beach areas is more important than the number of trucks parked at one spot of beach. There are times when there are hundreds of trucks at the Point, anglers can be elbow to elbow, so what?
- To comply with the management plan's objectives and the purpose of the national seashore, more areas of the Seashore must be off limits to ORVs.
- Obviously there is concern about over-crowding at Cape Point. I don't go near there any more during crowded periods and believe that is the mindset of many of each users. It is a self control situation.
- too confusing. An opportunity to make everybody mad.

#### **4.F. Other Permit System Options (if a permit system is implemented)**

**4.F.1** Establish an education component for natural resource awareness and understanding of the Seashore regulations as a requirement for obtaining a permit.

##### **Definitely Effective**

- Not all who come here are aware of what we are trying to protect.
- This is very important as most ORV users get a one-sided view from local businesses.
- THIS IS ABOUT THE ONLY VALID REASON FOR PERMITTING.

##### **May Be Effective**

- Is it demonstrated that education linked to permits reduces violations, or if my assumption is correct, violators of Seashore regulations will proceed to violate with, or without education.
- Good idea, but ought to apply to all CAHA users, not just ORV permittees.
- Education and awareness in the form of written regulations much like a fishing license rulebook issued with a permit may be effective. Not acceptable as requirement to study and take a test to obtain a permit.

##### **Not Effective**

- It should not be a requirement but a recommendation.
- Skip any requirement for the permit other than payment of the fee. The rest is simply government for government's sake.
- Acknowledgment of rules and regulations are enough.
- Keep it simple use signs

**4.F.2** Work with local organizations to provide beach driving training related to permitting.

**Definitely Effective**

- The locals must be empowered. I have been very impressed with the knowledge and passion of these people. They want access but also protection of the resource
- People who have property or live near the beach should be first to receive permits.

**May Be Effective**

- May be difficult to arrange for visitors.
- Only as an OPTION. Guys that have been driving on the beach for twenty years will flip their lids.
- The cost of implementation does not justify the value added
- Restrict beach driving training to printed and video materials. Required viewing of a short video should provide sufficient training for any licensed driver.
- Will all drivers be required to take “driver training”, even the ones who have been driving here for years? Or is there a “grandfather” provision?
- As long as a comprehensive written test is developed and administered by the NPS.

**Not Effective**

- Not feasible
- Not necessary. Anyone can learn to drive on the beach with a little information and a little practice.
- Not acceptable requirement to take a test to obtain a permit nor burden local organizations with expense. Local orgs do not enforce nor should they train.

**4.F.3** Revoke permits for certain violations (drunk driving, unsafe operation, resource closure entry); permits would be revoked for the remainder of the permit year.

**Definitely Effective**

- perhaps not for first offence
- if multiple revocations revoke permanently
- Yes - restricting problem operators would go a long way toward solving problems.
- A minimal response necessary and expected along with fine or jail time appropriate to nature of violation.

- Some violations deserve revocation of several years to permanent revocation of the privilege to drive on the Park beaches. Drunk, a year to several years and/or included LOCAL community service. Willful “resource closure entry” permanent revocation that can be brought back with “local community service” for several years.
- Yes and allow users to report violators (self police)
- Permits should be withheld for a longer than a year depending on the violation.
- And... revoke it twice, permanently revoked.

#### **May Be Effective**

- This should be done for only the most serious offenses.
- Only if found guilty in a court of law.
- I would prefer the tiered approach discussed earlier.

#### **Not Effective**

- There are already laws in place that cover this aspect of driving without making new ones.

**4.F.4** Issue different permits for each island (color coded) to consider different carrying capacities for different islands.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- And even color code high use areas.

#### **May Be Effective**

- If there are separate passes for each beach then yes this would be effective.
- May be interpreted as just another method to get more money(fees/taxes) from ORV users.

#### **Not Effective**

- Congestion is self limiting. Advising of number already using area at entry point will allow operator to decide if he wants to go elsewhere or put up with congestion.
- The permit should include the entire seashore.
- Since I fish Oregon Inlet, H.I and O.I. I would need to pay the fee for 3 different permits. Do the visitors that stay on Hatteras Island get charged a fee to visit the beach on Ocracoke Island?
- This would require multiple permits as many people who fish multiple islands during their visit, this would just increase cost.
- too restrictive. many fish from Oregon inlet to Ocracoke.
- What happens when visitors can't even get on the beach? A controlled program will lose tourism...something I know the government isn't necessarily concerned about.
- Too complicated
- KISS Keep it simple stupid

- Access to Hatteras Island and Ocracoke Island should be one permit
- Part of the charm of the CHNS for surf fishing is the freedom to pursue fish according to wind, current, water temperature, and where the fish are. This is a seashore- wide experience not a one ramp or one island experience.

**4.F.5** Use a permit system as an educational tool requiring a contact, possibly on-line, so education and information can be provided.

**May Be Effective**

- This could be an alternative that should be considered.
- The system's user list can be used for communication of the resource status. Any further communication should be optional.
- Not everyone has a computer
- Some limited benefit, but this would only be of value to novice users and first time visitors.
- should allow for visitors to gain permit before arriving on Outer Banks
- In-person contact should be required to prevent fraud.

**Not Effective**

- Useless and overreaching.
- Only makes it more difficult to obtain a permit. and costly
- Permits are a management tool, on line contact is not appropriate.
- Not all visitors carry a Blackberry or iphone.

**4.F.6** Provide a built-in periodic review process (2-5 years) to determine if the permitting system is functioning correctly. The system would be adaptive so NPS can react to increasing demand and Seashore use.

**Definitely Effective**

- I am opposed to "adaptive management" in principle, but there should definitely be some ongoing evaluation of the effectiveness of the process and go through the needed regulatory changes if justified.
- System should adapt to the changing needs of the seashore usage
- Yes, times and uses change.

**May Be Effective**

- This is a no-brainer. Anything should be reviewed and/or audited for effectiveness. I would recommend 1 year review after implementation, and then every 2-3 years afterwards.
- A review process had better be a part of the process, as well as an independent audit.
- Only if the original intent of the permit is not changed. An advisory council with all key stakeholders should be used and there should be an adequate period of public comment if changes are required.
- Would require the definitions of functioning correctly in advance of the review.

- Periodic review may be effective if the original intent of the permit is not abrogated. It should include public comment and documented public feedback. An advisory committee would be appropriate.
- Periodic review may be effective if the original intent of the permit is not abrogated. Any review should include public comment and documented public feedback. An advisory committee would be helpful. Academic if there are NO PERMITS!

### **Not Effective**

- I think that this would give the government too much free play to stop ORV usage.
- Don't trust the NPS to decide the changes without citizen input.
- My permit would be for one year. I would expect NPS to constantly monitor the situation.

### **Additional comments regarding permitting options:**

- I don't believe a permit system will accomplish the objectives without reducing the number of users. That will be detrimental to the tourist base and adversely impact business. A permit system will provide more structure and control of the users but will add significant cost. That cost will be passed on to the users in the form of fees and will result in an adverse business impact. A limited number of permits creates an artificial shortage severely restricts use.
- The beaches within the Park belong to every taxpaying citizen of the United States. If a permit system is established it should be free to anyone who applies, and for all areas. Permit holders who are found guilty of serious violations such as DWI or reckless driving should have their permits revoked. There should not be a limited number of permits because most visitors to the Park are there for week or less at a time.
- If a permit is established do not limit the amount of stickers sold, instead limit the number of vehicles allowed in an area
- I think permits could be a great tool and source for revenue to address site specific costs the NPS occurs. However I'm opposed to the permit process. I oppose it mainly because this is a National Seashore taken care of by the NPS and therefore is paid for by taxpayers already. To add another cost for the use is not appropriate to me. However if that is what it takes to ensure a safer more natural place and accomplish the NPS's objectives then it should be considered.
- I am totally opposed to a permit system on Cape Hatteras. My main concern is that it will be used to ultimately eliminate the number and eventually all ORV use on Hatteras and Ocracoke Island. As a long time user of this resource the ORV users have lost more and more access every year. Without ORV access to those beaches there is absolutely no need for me or my family to return there and that is a yearly tradition that goes back over 30 years. I have an 8 year old son and a 10 year old daughter. It is disturbing to think that they may never get to enjoy surf fishing as I have because they can't access the areas to get to the fish. Cape Hatteras National Recreational Seashore was set aside for the people to enjoy the beauty that those barrier islands hold and should be kept that way. By taking away ORV access or limiting it, that would bring great hardship on the economy down there because people will simply stop visiting.
- No permit system is needed and if so should only be used during the tourist season.
- I am adamantly opposed to any permit requirement for any type of access to the Cape Hatteras National RECREATIONAL area.
- Permits are not needed if enforcement of existing rules and regulations were presently happening. Put the permit monies in extra enforcement and education.

- 1. Permits should be used to indicate drivers understand the regulations and their responsibilities. 2. Permits should allow access to all ORV regions. 3. Permits should be available to everyone and not be limited in number. 4. They should be of reasonable cost. 5. They should be obtainable on line. 6. There should be annual as well as limited usage permits. 7. Permits should be revoked after serious violations.
- Any permit system should be used to incorporate educational needs deemed necessary. They should be available to anyone and any fees should be reasonable so that no one is prohibited from enjoying the part because of cost. The most cost effective way to administer a system would be over the internet. For those obtaining a limited use permit, this would be a good way to notify people planning a trip about potential closures.
- I grew up on the New Jersey shore and had to have a permit to drive on the beach on Island Beach State Park with an annual permit, I would have to wait at least 10 yrs to get a permit if I could afford it...I come to Hatteras once or twice a year for 2 weeks to fish...if I were not able to drive on the beach to fish then there would be no point in coming and would be forced to find another vacation spot...by my figures I spend an average of 4000.00 per year....an educated guess is I've put \$60,000.00 in the local economy on vacations in Hatteras...has anyone computed the loss in money if access to the beaches were restricted
- As a tax payer you are asking me to pay for NPS services twice. Does this mean that I can expect better NPS services at the Outer Banks? I think NOT. Adding an additional layer of government and cost to this process is not the answer. I strongly reject being charged a second time for services that we both know will not meet the needs that they were originally set up to provide. The NPS will continue to be limited by their overall budget and if a permit system is added then the fees from this process will be used to also fill in other NPS short-falls. Let's not kid ourselves. NPS is currently struggling to meet the demands of enough ranges and other services for the Outer Banks. What is it about a permit system that's going to make the base service better or the new permit system run smoothly? Please, let's stop this permit discussion NOW. Let's keep it simple.
- The entire permit system sounds like an administrative and enforcement mess to me. A free permit with an online or readily available educational element would not be a bad thing but the overall effectiveness of a permit system would be questionable in my opinion.
- Do not issue permits. This is a time consuming and costly activity that does not provide any discernable benefit.
- I've been going to Hatteras since 1982 and don't see a need for ORV permits. Like I said it appears to me to be a way to generate money. If that's your goal just say it and be done with it. The way the economy has been going only the wealthy will have the money to do things in this country anyway. Most of the people I meet surf fishing are hard working middle class people. The backbone of our economy. The ones that pay taxes and have little else after our families. If we're lucky enough to have some disposable income we might not be able to go to Europe or the tropics but maybe we can take our kids fishing at the beach.
- The Cape Hatteras National Seashore does not exist in a vacuum. There are 7 villages with thousands of residents. The questions raised in this section have an impact much larger than preserving natural resources and promoting visitor safety. These and other questions raised may impact the livelihood and economic viability of the Hatteras Island Community. The item themselves, and the way in which implemented, can show an attitude that visitors are not welcome to Hatteras Island. This is not consistent with the National Parks Act. The only place I can see for considering this issue is that in the first purpose of protecting and preserving natural and cultural resources... that the Hatteras Island community and economy is considered a cultural resource.
- Overall, no permits are necessary. The status quo is currently working. If any type of permit system is implemented it would need to be based on low admin costs, high on operator education, and be easily obtained. The permit if necessary should not cost the user. However, it does not make sense to implement a free permit plan and expect the taxpayers to pay for the cost of the permit system. If a fee must be charged for the permit then cost of the permit to the ORV user must be as low as reasonable achievable. There should not be any type of limit on the number of permits including restrictions by area. No first come, first serve and no lotteries, etc. The permits should not be specialized for certain high use areas or islands etc. This would only serve to confuse the public and make enforcement more difficult. The implementation, control, enforcement, and management of a permit serves very low value. The overhead and management of a permit control system is not warranted and overall would be a hassle for the visitors that is not necessary. The permit requirements would not result in a visitor enhancing experience.

- Permits are not needed and never have been. The rules that are in place would be enough if properly enforced. Better enforcement of current laws would solve a good many of the problems that exist.
- I do not think that ORV operators should be permitted, especially at a monetary cost, when pedestrians would be allowed to continue unpermitted access. A pedestrian or pet walking across a dune or littering could cause significant damage to the environment or protected species.
- A permit system implanted correctly can be a valuable asset. However, any system that is unduly restrictive or prohibitive will not serve the best interest of anyone.
- I am not in favor of any ORV permits but if they are required in the future, The plan needs to be simple and uncomplicated and to not increase existing restrictions to ORV beach access
- I do not support a permit system. I believe this will turn into a revenue system for the park and will not support the current system of free entry for all citizens.
- NO Permits!! They are punitive. They are restrictive. The public is taxed/fined too much now. The public should not have to pay a fee for utilizing undeveloped public land. Enforcement will cost more than could possibly be gained from any reasonable fee associated with the permit. A no cost (free) permit makes a little sense IF you require an education course (e.g.online) to be completed prior to issue. But once again you still have the enforcement problem. Congestion is only a problem when areas are restricted. People will naturally spread out. Open more of the National Seashore. If permits are required with a fee, the NPS will be asking for a. violations, b. vastly increased enforcement requirements and c. public resentment and backlash. They will get all three!
- Any permit system if adopted should be free and unlimited.
- Permits are good but can also be expanded to ensure that the vehicle meets certain standards, as well. The focus in this document is on the operator, not the vehicle. For example, a vehicle that leaks oil should not be allowed. Standards on the size of tires .. i.e. the 'monster tires' .... these tires should not be allowed on the beach as they are too aggressive.
- People I really, really hope this doesn't happen. I drive six hours gladly to get to Hatteras' can't imagine getting there just to be told there is no room. I have been down for every major holiday for years, and yes it is crowded but we have always found a place for our group. I do realize that nothing stays the same and perhaps some time in the future there will have to be a permit program. I just hope that it can be done without ruining someone's vacation. The beaches in front of Frisco Campground and Cape Point are VERY popular family oriented places that frequently are where we go, both for fishing and just to see old friends. I guess my main concern is the loss of the freedom we have enjoyed for what seems like forever. I just hope the people who do the specific capacity study take every area into consideration and understand that to many people a crowd isn't necessarily a bad thing
- I am fundamentally against a permit system. It could lead to additional congestion and it would be an administrative nightmare. If it is inevitable, then the cost should be kept to a minimum preferably free.
- I believe that a permit system is not needed because it will take resources away from the beach. I also believe that the rangers have enough important work to do, we should not turn them into parking lot police. A permit system seems to discourage beach use. Even though I use the beach a lot some people just come down every now and then and this puts a burden on them.
- Any discussion of permits is a sensitive subject, best left to the Reg-Neg committee. My personal feeling is that due to exponential increase it would require in enforcement and administration, that this would be very ineffective at the seashore and could result in drastic economic consequences to the island inhabitants and businesses.
- I oppose the establishment of a permit system. If permits are required, permanent residents of Hatteras and Ocracoke Islands should have year round free access permits. The operator of the ORV should be the one permitted. Anyone could drive a permitted vehicle. However, if the sole purpose of the permitting system is to control vehicles only, then the vehicle should be permitted. If an ORV permit system is established, the NPS should be the lone issuing

agency. Each permit must have an ID number, readily visible on the vehicle, charged a fair fee for its duration and allow the permitted driver access to all designated ORV areas. A single violation of the park rules should jeopardize the continued issuance of a permit to that operator.

- I feel permits are a bad idea. They are unnecessary, would be a nuisance to visitors and residents, especially if a set number is issued. Some people may only drive the beaches once or twice a year while many residents such as myself drive on the beach frequently. Permitting has not advantages that I can see.
- People who come to vacation in and around this park consider it a “rite of passage” to do 2 things when they are here; drive out to the Point. And cast out a line and fish with some of the “regulars” in the “conga line”, just to say they did it. This should never be taken away. There are times at the Point when the trucks are 6 to 10 deep, the fishermen are fishing elbow to elbow lines are tangled fish are being caught up & down the beach. It’s raining, the wind is blowing sand everywhere, anglers are yelling at each other, kind words sometimes, sometimes not. That is what we have spent tens of thousands of dollars on trucks & equipment to participate in, do not ever take this away. How would you police this, some only drive here to fish late at night and leave at dawn, several times a month. When Cobia swim close to shore (mid May-mid June) there will be hundreds of lines in the water, many kayaked out several hundred yards out, the trucks will spread out down to the south right up against the bird enclosure, this is when we wished the fishing beach was larger. I drive any one of 3 trucks, how would I handle the permit issue? I am probably by myself. Would I get 3 stickers, or a movable tag that I could move to the truck I am driving. If the driver is the one permitted, how do you know which truck they will drive? Or how do you know that the driver of a permitted truck is the permitted driver. Develop a list of “must carry” items for all ORVs; shovel, jack boards, tire gauge, tow rope/chain, portable toilet first, aid kit, etc. If a ORV doesn’t have an attachment point on both the front & back where a tow rope/chain can be attached, it should not be allowed on the beach. That is a cost the driver has to bare so they can enjoy the park. When a “permit” is “revoked” for drunk, unsafe driving, or “resource closure violation” local community service can be used by the offender to “buy back” their privilege to have a permit in the Park. Local community service has to benefit the Park and/or the local community. Volunteering to work for/ with NPS staff distributing literature, repairing resource closure fencing, beach cleanup, or goodwill ambassador can be used, the offenders awareness that breaking rules and laws, have serious consequences. There could be a program that a driver could take a test(in a NPS office) that would teach an in depth knowledge of ORV issues, conservation beach rules, etc. that with a passing score the driver would get a special(color& style) of hang tag. This would set them apart, and garner respect. Some of us “do” try to set a good example.
- It is tempting to consider a permit that is akin to a fishing license, i.e. readily available at a minimum fee, with no limits. All one needs to do is read a page describing beach driving and park rules and regulations, then sign off. Sounds great as a vehicle for education, NOT. Just think about the software agreements we see after we install any software. Or how about the privacy notices you get. Do your read them? No, most people simply click accept and go about business. In a nut shell, the benefit is not justified by the cost. Instead you have one more rule to enforce. The park is large enough to provide for a variety of visitor experiences with minimal user conflicts. For example, there are more than enough miles of beaches for park visitors. The beaches at each ramp offer their own distinctive features and varied opportunities for recreation--i.e. family oriented, hard easily navigable, steep soft sand with low density usage, etc. Pea Island offers the opportunity for an undeveloped area. Seasonally, 40% or more of the beaches are available for passive recreation. Quite simply, the park does not need permits. Most all of the perceived user conflicts, resource issues, and perceived visitor safety issues arise from violations of current park rules. That is, most issues could be resolved by enforcement of existing rules and policies that can adapt as areas are closed either for resource or safety reasons so as to minimize user conflicts due to crowding in areas that are not normally high density areas. Finally, in terms of funding for recreation, there is no basis for charging ORV users and not passive recreation users. In point of fact, passive recreation users require much more in the way of support services (i.e. more parking lots and more frequent intervals) and based upon the relative number of pedestrian violations reported this year, more in the way of law enforcement. This being the case, if a fee is required to support recreation, it should be a park entrance fee paid by all visitors to the park.
- NO PERMITS DRIVE DOWN THERE SPEND FOR A HOUSE AND CANT GET PERMIT WILL I COME BACK..WHY WOULD I WANT A ANNUAL PERMIT WHEN I ONLY AM THERE 2 TO 3XS A YEAR.ON SOME TRIPS WE CAMP AND EATCH THE WEATHER TO PLAN A TRIP DOWN LIKE 2 OR 3 DAYS IN ADVANCE, NO PERMITS.

- There should be no permit system. In time it will discourage visitors and the local economy would suffer. The so called conservation groups that don't want anybody to enjoy the Park would have gotten their way.
- ORV permits are not necessary in my view. If it is decided that a Permit system is going to be instituted, there should be NO limitations on the number of Permits issued. The Cape Hatteras National Seashore and Recreational Area is plenty large enough to accommodate the number of visitors each year, and no family should be prohibited from enjoying this National Park.
- Issue a lifetime permit for one (1) nominal fee to seniors over 65. This offer could be similar to the NC saltwater fishing license. This permit should only be offered to NC residents and NC non-resident property owners. These people have monetary investments in the area
- If there is going to be a need for permits, they should be free and available on line. Local clubs like for instance NCBBA can and do help with information to educate ORV users. The members associated with these clubs are always looking for ways to improve beach use and access, dune repair and longevity, and properly share this resource with nature. I am a member of both NJBBA where I reside and NCBBA where I visit once or twice a year. I cherish the times spent on the beach and besides the fishing fine these areas fascinating. I personally don't see the need for ORV permits. I carry a current fishing license while in Cape Hatteras which is purchased on the internet. If needed this information is available to people in charge and all the information pertaining to me and even when I'm going to be in the area. If there has to be money raised to be used for enforcement or education, I would rather pay a little more for my license than pay for a permit.
- Permits should be priced very high so that users realize it is a privilege to take a motorized vehicle into the national seashore. Fees should be based on the duration of the permit. It is a user fee. The more you use, the more you pay. Permit fees should be based on a system that pays for the system: the prices of permits, infrastructure, education, law enforcement, and especially restoring the destruction caused by the use of vehicles.
- No ORV Permitting system will ever be acceptable. We're not going to roll over like they did up north.
- Regarding a Permit System, I am in general against permits because I see them as a first step in limiting access by numbers because NPS staff/\$ resources are not likely going to be able to handle the volume. However, I struggle with how to effectively educate folks regarding beach driving. I might consider a permit system because of the experience I had at Oregon Dunes National Recreational Area. There the permit was \$10, was good for 2 years and the required equipment/vehicle inspection with a brief run thru of the rules takes about 20-30 minutes. So I might (repeat MIGHT) consider a permit if the permit is (1) readily available without the horror story waits we have heard about in other areas, (2) the number of permits is not limited, (3) any permit fee only includes cost to administer the program, (4) is valid for 2 years for a given vehicle and driver, (5) includes a requirement to have read a set of rules and tips on beach driving as well as other Seashore rules such as resource closures, fires, fireworks, dead fish on the beach, etc. and (6) includes a requirement to have certain equipment in the vehicle like shovel, tow strap, board for jack, etc. And I emphasize again "might consider" principally in order to support beach driving education. In addition I might consider an entrance fee like at many NPS areas. There could be a cost break for property owners and certainly delivery vehicles. Facilities for all activities, not just ORV use, could be supported by such a fee. Seems easy to administer at the Ocracoke Village Ferry Dock and on Rt 12 just South of Old Nags Head/Oregon Inlet Road but Ramp 1 would be a problem and I would not like to see that ramp closed.
- Permits themselves are not of much use if realistic carrying capacities are not established. Realistic carrying capacities are essential to protect the resource, keep all visitors safe and be consistent with another National Seashore. I favor a system where the Park is divided into 6 geographical ORV units: Bodie Island, North Hatteras Beach, Cape Point, Hatteras Inlet, North Ocracoke, South Ocracoke. There should be one driving permit that is good for driving anywhere it is allowed in the Park. Each of the individual ORVs units should have separate ORV carrying capacities. When one unit's carrying capacity is reached a visitor would have the option to queue up until a space is made available or try another unit. Anyone who passes the test should be entitled to get an ORV permit for themselves and their vehicle. Selling a limited number of permits is not an impartial way of managing the resource. Everyone should have the same opportunity to drive on the beach. High use areas, like Cape Point, should incorporate a shuttle system in place to afford those people that do not have an ORV, ORV permit, or do not want to wait in a queue an opportunity to recreate in that unit. Individual vehicles should be licensed. Unlicensed drivers may drive a licensed vehicle if a licensed operate is in the vehicle or licensed drivers can drive other properly

licensed outfitted vehicles. Fees for license should be commensurate for all the cost associated with ORV management (including but not limited to resource management directly related to ORV, use extra patrol vehicles and law enforcement rangers) There should be no charge for individual licenses. Only vehicles should be required to have a paid license. If permits fees are not commensurate to the cost of enforcing all the costs of ORV management then suitable funds have to be established before ORV use can proceed. If funds are insufficient then ORV accessed should be restricted until funds are obtained. Consequences for violations should range from warnings and minor fines to lifetime loss of driving privileges. Drivers should be responsible for finding out the most current regulations and special conditions. The NPS should have a dedicated updated phone line with a recorded message of any changes to ORV use and posted rules at consistent appropriate locations.

- I feel it is important to recognize the natives and long time residents of the area. Free permits should the Seashore that that route would be way of extending an arm of friendship to the surrounding community. This in turn should help with community relations. As stated above, color coding stickers or permits to high use areas is an easily recognized and inexpensive option.
- I believe that a permit system is currently unwarranted. On most days, on most of the beaches, ORVs, pedestrians & wildlife are coexisting successfully. On the 50 days a year when it's too crowded at the Cape Point or the inlets, try to see it positively. Thousands of citizens are enjoying nature with their friends & family instead of sitting in front of a beach house television watching "reality TV". I concede that persistent, destructive overcrowding may, at some time in the future, mandate a permit system. But we're not there yet. I feel strongly that every other idea imaginable should be tried before resorting to permits.
- I continue to ask what problem or issue will permits solve or address. Permit issuance and enforcement is going to take resources and funding that NPS does not have today and is unlikely to obtain in the future. There are current rules and regulations in place that should be enforced. Strong consideration needs to be given to increasing penalties and fines for rule and regulation infractions. The issuing of permits will not address speeding or other illegal activities in the park. Again, the questions being posed, make it appear the outcome is predetermined. ORV's are necessary to access the park and the resources of the park. Permits will only serve to begin limiting access to "our" National Park. One organization has already dubbed this approach as "Management by Padlock."
- Throughout the above questions I am on record as opposing permits. By Contrast I am on record FOR SEVERAL YEARS AS BEING IN FAVOR OF A PERMIT SYSTEM TO THE CONSTERNATION OF BOTH Frank Folb and Brian Perry Although I am quite certain there will be some kind of permit system initiated I oppose it now because it would not be in the vision of what I have held for years. My premise has been that it is a privilege to drive on the beach and if one violated the rules he should be stripped of the privilege. A small fee \$15-25 I thought would subsidize the cost of the added enforcement personnel needed. Since hearing of the bottleneck experiences involved with obtaining permits at Cape Cod as well as similar stories from Assateague plus the fact that these fees are now over \$100 in each case and apparently increase yearly or thereabouts my concept would not jell with the apparent realities of what happens when the government gets control of the fee basis. The complexity of the many accesses to the seashore and the wide variety of vacationers who attempt to drive on the beach, the time consumed in obtaining a permit , watching videos, taking tests, demonstrating proper equipment would go some distance in discouraging people from wanting to drive on the beach(and maybe that is a good thing. In essence I don't trust the bureaucracy to run a permit system in an economical way. When the system is installed please make it as user friendly as possible. P.S. I am 84 years old and have been driving these beaches since 1962 so I will not be much effected by the beach permit system or the ability to drive on sand so my remarks are made with the current demographics in mind and not as how it will effect me personally;
- I do believe that there should be a local committee that oversees the NPS in any dealing with permits. That is with all procedures, costs, limits, etc. dealing with permits. Without an overseeing committee than no permits. I have seen NPS and governments in action
- The status quo is definitely the preferred course of action as far as permits are concerned. The promise of unchanged beach access promised by the NPS when CHNS was created is nullified by a permit system. We were permit holders for Assateague Island as noted in the comments and decide it was not worth the expense or effort to drive three hours and not be able to get on the beach while battling green head flies and mosquitoes. Gas was cheap then. Who would run their AC for three hours waiting for another truck to get off the beach. The nearby Ocean City areas economy is independent of ORV access. The villages of Rodanthe, Waves, Salvo, Avon, Buxton, Frisco, Hatteras Village, and

Ocracoke do. The economy of these villages is to a large part dependent upon the continued good faith of the NPS in maintaining the agreement that created CHNS. Tying ORV permits to fishing permits creates a one use beach as noted in the comments about Delaware. CHNS visitors have many interests and reasons for going off road.

- I am not necessarily in favor of a new permit. It is just another tax opportunity. If it is only to insure education, then it is going too far.
- \$75 - \$125. for an annual daytime permit affixed to the rear drivers side bumper. \$35. for a two week daytime ORV permit. \$200 - \$300. for a limited Overnite permit (ie ORVs can only drive a limited distance from the ramp to an overnite vehicle area and park on the back beach section: see Cape Cod NS ORV permit system). Each year prior to paying for a permit all drivers must watch a rules and beach resources AV program of approx. 10 min and sign their registration card verifying they watch and understood the AV program and know their permit will be revoked if rules are broken. I have a sample AV program used at Cape Cod for this purpose in the 1980s if anyone is interested in viewing.
- NPS does not have the budget or the manpower to operate a permit system. It would be an expense that would never cover its own costs. It would also be detrimental to the local economy, as many visitors would opt to go to seashores/parks nearer their homes rather than travelling to CAHA (where there is NOT a permit at this time). Many people would simply not want to add to their expenses & stop travelling to CAHA. Although NPS may wish to bring CAHA "into compliance" with the other seashores/parks, a permit system will not be good for the park or for the surrounding communities – who rely on the park for their livelihood. It is unworkable & ultimately not in the best interest of the park. The money spent on implementation of a permit system would be better spent on hiring more LE rangers. Permits are NOT acceptable within CAHA.
- This whole section assumes that ORV's are the only violators of closures when NPS figures from the 2007 weekly Resource Management Field Summary reports show that 75.8% of bird and 95.2% of turtle violations are done by pedestrians. Education of the entire visiting public is the answer. If a permit system is introduced and the penalty for violating a closure was revocation of the permit, what would be done to a pedestrian (who does not have to have a permit) who violates a closure? If you tie permits to education than all visitors should be permitted and I don't believe that this is the answer
- One of the reasons my husband and I moved here was full access to the beach including ORV use. What would ORV permits accomplish? Why not have permits to walk on beach, or walk your dog on the beach? Now doesn't that sound stupid? Does NPS have the manpower/resources/funds to implement and police this? What would be the point of a permit system, just to have a record of who is allowed to drive on the beach, effort to try to educate ORV drivers (see 4.B.1), restrict number of ORVs on beach? **I am against ORV permitting in all forms.** But, if permits have to be issued in order to insure that the ORV drivers are getting the education of the rules and regulations of beach driving, resource protection, etc., then an unlimited number of permits should be issued after the education is performed and maybe a short written test taken (actual "driving test" would consume too many NPS resources/time/money). There should be a nominal charge for a permit. Multi-year permits or permits that do not expire would be best. Drivers who abuse the privilege of beach driving (drunk, reckless, disturbing resource management area, etc.) should have their ORV permit suspended or revoked and pay serious fines for their violations. After payment of any fines, the offender could be able to buy back their permit privilege by performing lengthy community service at NPS' discretion. Any limits on the number of permits issued would not be fair since how would NPS know how many "permitted" vehicles were at a particular beach at any one particular time or day? What purpose would limiting permits serve? Some with permits might go weekly, or monthly, or 4-6 times a year, or may go 2 or less times a year. It would be too costly, take too much manpower and tie traffic up unnecessarily if permits were limited by area (controlled capacity). Why don't we try to educate every tourist beach goer and make them purchase a permit to go swimming? How many people get drunk or get caught in a rip current, etc. and have to be saved by lifeguards or drown because there are no lifeguards where and when these idiots try to swim? Doesn't it seem unfair to single out ORV drivers as the culprits for every problem there is in the Park? Many more pedestrians, dogs and predators disturb the wildlife that you are trying to protect than ORV drivers. And if requiring an ORV permit was not bad enough, to even dare to put limits on the number of permits issued is unconscionable in a National Park. I felt my blood boiling as I read some the stupid statement in this section. Many of them were obviously written by someone who wants all of our beaches closed to ORV use. I say ORV's have always been here since the invention of the wheel. Why should the many responsible ORV drivers be punished just because a few don't know how to behave responsibly behind the wheel in the sand? I have always hated group punishment just

because a few misbehave. Bottom line, issuing permits is going to cost money, time and NPS resources. But for what purpose?

- Permits are essential. They provide an opportunity for serious education of those using ORVs on the park's fragile beaches. The system should be simple and the fee should be large.
- Need to define the objective for a permit system. Would it be to insure that all drivers have been educated in proper vehicle use on the beach? Or would it be to restrict the number of vehicles on the beach? If the first (educated drivers) then an unlimited number of permits can be issued following beach driving introduction by brochure, video, etc. If the second (restricted numbers), then permits are not needed. Just have a LE person count vehicle entries and exits to limit the numbers to the carrying capacity. If you restrict the number of permits, how do you handle the visitor spending one day in CHNS and just wants to see the beach for a brief period and look for shells? For a permit system to be effective, it has to be enforced. How is this to be done? By having LE staff at each ramp to check permits almost 24/7? By having constant patrols to check permits?
- I came "home" this summer to Nags Head to share the beauty of the beach with friends who have never been, only to be told I had to have a saltwater permit to grab my trusty fishin' pole and head to the beach and fish... I was appalled. You do NOT have the rights to tell us you OWN the ocean, and now you want to regulate and say that you have the right to own the beach. Absolutely not! No Permit Systems. Ever! If your vehicles ground clearance will "permit" you to make it to the sand, then that's all the permit you should have to have. Give us a break. They already tax everything else!
- I am against permits of any type as I have seen that are not working well in other parks that have them. Long lines, limits & the process to obtain one are all strikes against them. If a system is implemented, it should be one with no fee; no limit on the numbers issued & is available on-line. If a fee is charged, it should be limited to the cost of running the program & not used to raise money to run the park. All fees charged should only be used for improvements for ORV use, not for "passive recreation".
- Permit money needs to go 100% back into Hatteras National Seashore.
- Any and all means to institute permits would be labor intensive, administratively costly, a burden to visitors and locals, as well as costly in the long run by either permit fees or taxes to us.
- Why not put a spot on Cable Channel 12 regarding rules and regulations and driver safety, or make a brochure and place them at marinas, visitor information stations, tackle shops, etc.
- Permits will not work and are not the answer. Currently rules and regulations being enforced would preclude many of the issues facing the park.
- Permits are not required at Cape Hatteras and any discussion is part of the Reg-Neg/Negotiated Rulemaking.
- I have answered some of the permits question but on second thought I am not in favor of permits so I am not going to answer the rest of the question. As long as these beaches here at Cape Hatteras have been open we have not had permits I can see why we need them now
- O.R.V. Permits are not the way to go. N. P.S. people have enough to do already without fooling with a permit system for beach entry. This would only raise the cost of operating CHNS, when we don't have the money now, to do it right.
- While some popular areas do become crowded, there is rarely any problems. Limiting access may well cause significant conflicts.
- Again the rental market is going to be a stumbling block. They see no need for restrictions without strict enforcement.
- Permits spell disaster for your local economy. We come on vacation to spend all of our days at the beach. We do not wish to sit in a hot vehicle to access the peace and serenity awaiting someone to come off so that the next person can

enter. If we want to sit in traffic, well stay home and probably have less grief. Just because you have to establish guidelines through the proper protocol doesn't mean that the current system has to be totally revamped. We can live in harmony with nature.

- I think that a permit system would be good if, and only if, it was combined with a great restriction of areas in which ORVs were allowed. ORVs should not be allowed in any of the prime birding / wildlife areas such as Cape Point, the Hatteras Spit, Ocracoke's South Point, ect.
- We only have ramp 27 for handicap people, I like to see more for people. Need ramps. [difficult to decipher]
- Just don't think we need any new taxes-particularly one that covers "relaxation".
- A permit would keep inexperienced ORV drivers off the beach without some formal educational materials on beach driving and seashore aspect.
- Permits should be the last option. If NPS decides to use them, they should be free and available to everyone. The permit application process should be as simple as possible.
- Please no permits. Fishing license - \$30.00, gas - \$3.25, permit - ??? Getting to expensive to come here.
- Please do not start a permit system! A permit system will, in my opinion be the most counter productive act possible. You need to only look at Cape Cod and Assateague Island to sterimine the expensive, devise atmosphere generated by the issue of permits. Cost - while a potential money - maker for the NPS it would be a disenfranchise for the poorer visitor to the park or poor islanders. Enforcement - an almost impossible task for officer rangers who deterimined who are who are the lucky ones to get beach access for how long and who move them on the end of there allotted time. This will negate any goodwill and sense of fairness built up at the park.
- When the park was set up, it was for the free enjoyment of the park-a permit would not be following the mandate that was originally set up.
- What is NPS's purpose I suggesting an ORV permit in the plan. A permit in every setting I am aware of has resulted in quots. Permits and quotas are not viable components in an our plan. If one is enacted it should be park wide access without the pain expense, and hassle of a permit that will allow access to all. Basic rules on flora/fauna. Basic driving rules/ clear understanding by users. Good law enforcement , use of citations. A permit system can get so costly and complicated to purchase, implemant and use that it is not worthwhile to do it.
- According history of the Cape Hatteras Seashore, beaches are to be left open to all residents for their recreation and fishing at all times
- The current no permit system is definitely the preferred way to go. Any type of permit system will certainly increase NPS costs and enforcement requirements and will be at leasat a minor annoyance for all visitors to the park. If any sort of permit system is implemented, all Dare County and Currituck County , including the mainland residents should be able to get a one time, lifetime no cost permit that could be issued again sa vehicle change.
- To avoid discrimination all users of the seashore would have to be permitted. Cottage owners seeking privatization of their beaches would have to ensure that
- I vigorously oppose a permit system. Why break something that has worked for so many years? If one is found to be necessary then please have the permit unlimited and include the full National Seashore.
  - All the permits in the world will not convince some to reduce their tire pressure to 20 psi or drive in a civilized manner.
  - Charge everybody for park use, not just ORV users. Hae a gate at Whale Bone Junction and Ocracoke Ferry Dock. Charge a fee for every person who enters the park. A toll booth at each location should work.

- I am fundamentally against a permit system. It could lead to additional congestion and it would be an administrative nightmare. If it is inevitable, then the cost should be kept to a minimum, preferably free.
- Any of the permits should be applied to both user groups, both ORVs and pedestrians. If the ORV user is limited to marked corridors with pullout every 50 yards and two lanes, the user is limited to that space. The ORV user can only reach the water as a pedestrian user after his ORV is parked within a pullout. A pedestrian user can come into contact with closures, if closures are properly bypassed by corridors, the ORV users are pedestrian users. Both ORV and pedestrian permits should be required if a permit is to be issued.
- The whole permit concept is unnecessary! Too much effort and a waste of money and resources to control people using the beach! If the ranger went into a low-key mode and only dealt with “major issues” there would be lots less problems! You’re trying to expand the control and make it more complex and spend more money when not necessary. Stop wasting resources and trying to think up more complex ways of limiting people at the beach.
- Crowding is self regulating and rarely an issue. How about extra LE for holidays and events? We can import them from all over the country to guard Piping Plovers, why can’t we have some to allow beach users the freedom to use the part of the beach they wish to use, but they didn’t get there first so now they can’t? One of the reasons travel to the seashore is because it is not crowded, so why all this focus on one holiday weekend that was severely understaffed by NPS LE!
- I firmly believe a permit system is the best solution for ORV management. It would be self limiting so numbers would not be an issue, bring in needed revenue for NPS, eliminate the occasional driver who I believe is responsible for most of the violations and would help park rangers monitor beach driving. Most fishermen will oppose this, yet they will catch \$100 annually on fishing equipment. The NPS must bite the bullet on this. It is a great compromise when other solutions might be total closure or severely restricted each access. Suggest annual fee to be \$75 tp \$125 and a two-weeks fee for \$50.
- I strongly support a fee for use of national park service areas. I am strongly against a permit with or without fee for ORVs. There should be a fee when one enters the park at every park entrance for everyone across the board with gates and several security guard houses. The fees can be 1 day, 2 day, 1 week, 1 month, annual. The fees should be substantial and should pay a significant portion of the NPS expenses. The only possible exception is commercial but then that creates more problems of criteria, implementation, and enforcement, etc.
- If the overall purpose of a permit is to raise funds, do it on a volunteer basis. I personally would pay to have beach access but not by a mandatory permit. Many visitors come from out of state to enjoy our beaches. I feel a permit would definitely have an economic impact to the counties of Dare and Hyde. Tourism brings in lots of money.
- Any type of permitting system will be a lot of headaches for the NPS. These are some of the problems that come to mind right off: difficult to produce the program, cost of producing the permits, difficult to get to the users, difficult and costly to administer, costly to enforce, keeps officers from patrolling and enforcing existing rules
- To the contrary of some, rules are in place for beach driving. As evidenced by the court ruling concerning beach driving a violation over the Memorial Day weekend, 2007, violators can be cited, taken to court and fined. The rules are effective to the extent they are enforced. More rules / restrictions, do not make a better recreational park if they cannot be practically, fairly and cost effectively implemented and enforced. Limiting beach access or requiring permits is not a guarantee that those folks obtaining the required paper will use the resource in the manner prescribed. Punishing the informed, law abiding general public for the wrongful actions of a few is a misuse of the power granted government officials and agencies. From my experience, the seasonal closures in place at the villages are totally appropriate for their intended safe, summer recreational value. The expansions of closure area or timeframe are not an equitable use of the park resource. Village specific or area specific permits would not be cost effective or provide any more of a resource protection in any aspect. The concentration of beach ORV use in season would cause more congestion and conflict of resources on the “open” beach area. The temporary habitat closures are appropriate for their intended result. However, access could be improved around temp closures for safety issues surrounding weather and tide conditions.

- Obviously, none of us who are ORV users want permits, however, it may be the only way to keep impact under control while giving some measure of control to enforcement personnel. The biggest problem I see comes from the vastness of areas involved and the many access points available. Free permitting or at the very least cost covering fees should be appropriate. Weekly, bi-weekly or annual permits are suggested if permitting goes into effect. Education in some form should be required with some procedure to insure that the person actually studied the information required. Use of the internet, application and testing machines at various official NPS sites, possibly local town halls/police stations could be employed. Revocation with fining back up should be stressed and used as needed. It would be immensely difficult, not to say costly, to issue permits by individual sites and would be detrimental to users who frequently roam from site to site; how many permit stickers will one have to attach to a vehicle to enjoy a week of fishing from Corolla to Ocracoke?
- I am from out of state and feel an annual permit is the only way to go. Breaking it up into weeks will only complicate matters. Seeing a sticker on a CHNP Beach Access plate on front of an ORV with the year ( 2008 ) on it will certainly simplify things. If the sticker is for the current year it is good. Make the Permit Jan – Dec. Park law enforcement does not have the time to check and see if your bi weekly permit has expired. I am only down a few weeks a year and feel what is offered is spectacular and worth the money. Funds collected from such permits should be used for the permitting process, ORV maintenance and law enforcement. Do not allow these funds to leave the CHNP. An out of state fee of \$100 / year is quite reasonable. Included in the fee should also be the salt water fishing license for the person named on the ORV permit. All permitting for ORV access should be done online to cut down on costs. This would also be the most cost effective way to disseminate educational information and testing to acquire such permit.
- To avoid discrimination, all users of the seashore would have to be permitted. Cottage owners, seek privatization of their beaches would have to ensure that renters, passive so called rec users had permits. Charge everyone who enters the seashore \$5.00 permit
- The Cape Hatteras Recreational area is for recreation and is not a wildlife refuge or sanctuary. Therefore, public access should be given the utmost priority. If ORV permits become a reality, I will have lost my right to utilize a National park. I will also stop coming there and spend my recreational time and money elsewhere.
- It is tempting to consider a permit that is akin to a fishing license, i.e. readily available at a minimum fee, with no limits. All one needs to do is read a page describing beach driving and park rules and regulations, then sign off. Sounds great as a vehicle for education, NOT. Just think about the software agreements we see after we install any software. Or how about the privacy notices you get. Do you read them? No, most people simply click accept and go about business. In a nut shell, the benefit is not justified by the cost. Instead you have one more rule to enforce.
- The park is large enough to provide for a variety of visitor experiences with minimal user conflicts. For example, there are more than enough miles of beaches for park visitors. The beaches at each ramp offer their own distinctive features and varied opportunities for recreation--i.e. family oriented, hard easily navigable, steep soft sand with low density usage, etc. Pea Island offers the opportunity for an undeveloped area. Seasonally, 40% or more of the beaches are available for passive recreation. Quite simply, the park does not need permits.
- Most all of the perceived user conflicts, resource issues, and perceived visitor safety issues arise from violations of current park rules. That is, most issues could be resolved by enforcement of existing rules and policies that can adapt as areas are closed either for resource or safety reasons so as to minimize user conflicts due to crowding in areas that are not normally high density areas.
- Finally, in terms of funding for recreation, there is no basis for charging ORV users and not passive recreation users. In point of fact, passive recreation users require much more in the way of support services (i.e. more parking lots and more frequent intervals) and based upon the relative number of pedestrian violations reported this year, more in the way of law enforcement. This being the case, if a fee is required to support recreation, it should be a park entrance fee paid by all visitors to the park.
- Dare County is not in favor of a permitting system, especially if used to regulate access to the park. The number of permits issued does not necessarily reflect the number vehicles using an area on a given day. To regulate capacity will require a vehicle count whether there is a permit issued or not. Permitting also results in questions

as to the fairness of whatever process is used to determine who receives a permit and the method to determine appropriate capacity. Permitting may be effective if used only for law enforcement purposes so that repeat violators can be prohibited from access to the park and if the process to obtain the permit is easy and quick.

- Education and enforcement of regulations must deal with all CHNRS users. If a permit system is developed, it should also apply to non-ORV users. Most National Parks require admission fees or possession of the National Parks pass. This would be appropriate for access to CHNRS also. In general, ORV users should not be singled out. However, if the NPS has significant expense associated with ORV management, it would be acceptable to charge a nominal ORV permit fee to cover such costs. This should be a last resort. A quota system should not be used. The CHNRS is of sufficient size that the number of users should not be restricted. Over the past 30 years, usage had ebbed and flowed. But, with the possible exception of some holiday weekends at Oregon inlet north spit, the amount of ORV traffic has not interfered with the NPS directives for the management of the resource.
- The recently implemented NC saltwater fishing license program would be a good model as a starter. The NPS should be viewed as a resource protector, a regulation enforcer, and, most importantly, as an advocate for all legal users of the seashore, including ORV users. They should not develop or portray the role of an adversary.
- Permits only add to the inefficiencies of management. The staffing, overhead and enforcement costs will add a budgetary line item impossible to offset with the fees collected. There are approx 35 points of entry, where is your control point/s? We cannot accept lock and key management with a state highway, ferries, 2 airports and seven villages within this park. (Cape Cod has only 4 access points, Cape Lookout 2, most parks 1). Will you enforce permits with existing (non-existing) LE Rangers? If you permit drivers, any vehicle they may drive will be covered, how are they recognized? If you permit vehicles, anyone may be driving, how do you recognize authorized drivers? If a sticker is used, must everyone park head in/head out? It appears that permits are being viewed as a source of revenue rather than an ORV management tool.
- I am dead set against permits. I believe they are a tool to keep people from enjoying the resources that belong to all. NCBBA members in good standing should be exempt from permits. NCBBA members already acknowledge a code of ethics and receive educational information on how to operate an ORV carefully to preserve the resources, and have an identifying tag on their vehicles. I will say that if a permit system is THE ONLY OPTION, it should be modeled after the permits in Delaware administered by the DNREC. The permits are expensive but widely available. The Delaware permits are very, very expensive. CAHA permits must be free or at a very low fee - \$10 for both residents and non-residents.
- Law enforcement personnel is needed. There seems to be significant lack of resources applied to law enforcement and a whole lot of resources are invested into management of resources within the Park. This imbalance must be corrected by more funding to the Park for LE personnel or a re-allocation of funds whereby more LE personnel are in place within existing budget. If rules are in place and can never be enforced, plan will fail. Proper enforcement of rules will be required. I believe the implementation of a permit plan would cause significant harm to the ORV user and would in time, if not immediately, destroy the culture of the Park. If a permit plan could be put into place that did not limit the number of vehicles to the Park, then I would be open to the idea. In fact, I would support the idea of permits if there were a guarantee that vehicle limitation would never be a part of the system. BUT, I doubt that this guarantee would be possible. In time, limitation would develop. This would destroy the culture of the Park. Today, access to the park and ease of access is the key to the overall culture of the Park. If I have to "stand in line" to get on the beach, and may not be able to get on the beach based on number of permits issued, (or some other limitation criteria), then I will not go. And, if I stop going, so will a lot of other people. If this is what is wanted--to stop people from going, then perhaps this is the real reason for issuing permits. I fished once in Virginia under this type of system. It was a nightmare. It took all the fun out of being on the beach. So, limitation of ORV use is simply a giant step toward elimination of ORV use. Having said that, this is the permit system I would put into place IF I HAD TO PUT ONE IN PLACE: Guaranteed, unlimited permits issued for the entire Park. The system would offer 3 day permit, 2 week permit, and annual permit. Fees would be consistent with NC saltwater fishing fees and issued by same businesses, etc that issue fishing license. So, when I bought my license, I would also get my permit. All fees collected would go to Park to be used by the Park at its discretion. The permit would allow the designated ORV (identified by state license number on the ORV) access to any open ORV beach in the Park. When issued, the individual requesting the permit, would be asked to sign a simple form, perhaps 3 or 4 points made on the form. (the form would basically

state that the person signing understood the ORV regulations of the Park and agreed to them and would be responsible for his ORV use in the Park. Any fines to the ORV would go to permit holder. Safety points would be outlined on the form such as limit of air in tires, speed limit on beach, etc. At same time, a regulation pamphlet, which would be an overall part of the NPS educational program for ORV use in the Park--not just the permit program, would be given to the applicant. If the permit was for 3 days or two weeks, the permit could be displayed on driver side of windshield, or hung from rear view mirror. If the permit was for annual period, tag could be placed on bumper of ORV or displayed by driver as he would choose.

## **5. Other ORV Management Issues**

### **5.A. Carrying Capacity**

**5.A.1** Do not establish an ORV carrying capacity for the Seashore. (*status quo*)

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Any person who drives a distance and rents accommodations and purchases bait and tackle and food or other beach accouterments ought to have a place to enjoy the beach.

#### **May Be Effective**

- At some point an ORV carrying capacity may be needed to ensure a quality ORV experience and for protection of the resource.

#### **Not Effective**

- I believe that a true capacity should be defined, implementation could be difficult with so many access points
- Status quo appears ineffective; however would not establishing a minimum acceptable change standard, rather than carrying capacity be more effective?
- I sincerely do not believe it is possible to establish a "carrying capacity" as that term is generally understood. I do believe there is a number, perhaps the number there on the busiest day of (say) 2007 plus 10 percent, which should represent a "cap" on visitation. CAHA cannot absorb more visitors forever and somewhere it has to end. Making that number public now can save a lot of grief in years to come.
- The status quo is working well. Carrying Capacity is more impacted by development. The towns along the seashore don't seem to be concerned about this. The real benefit is thru education, awareness.
- People cluster in areas for specific reasons: i.e. fish blitzes, family or club gatherings, educational programs, etc. They don't stay at one spot forever, they move. (comment repeated for 5.A.2-5A.6)
- This invites total destruction of the natural resource.

**5.A.2** Establish an ORV carrying capacity for the Seashore.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Over due, but again minimum acceptable change may be more effective approach.
- One needs to know what they are dealing with in order to manage it. Buildings, parking lots, parking garages, metros, all have limits. Our beaches do to.

#### **May Be Effective**

- May be difficult to do and manage. ?scales to weigh at each ramp. Establish at permit purchase time, and then how to check later compliance?
- Heavy use areas vary with the time of day and season and weather. Law enforcement personnel need to be used for enforcing the rules and giving out tickets for violators instead of counting cars and ensuring how close together vehicles are packed. More enforcement personnel could be used in the areas more people are using. The park covers a large area, if one place is too crowded I'll go to another.

### **Not Effective**

- No criteria to define the carrying capacity
- This really doesn't meet any objectives directly.
- Costly to administer and subjective to interpretation.
- People would make multiple trips.
- The data previously provided to arrive at these and related issues was seriously flawed. So there is no objective way to measure this.
- I sincerely do not believe it is possible to establish a "carrying capacity" as that term is generally understood. I do believe there is a number, perhaps the number there on the busiest day of (say) 2007 plus 10 percent, which should represent a "cap" on visitation. CAHA cannot absorb more visitors forever and somewhere it has to end. Making that number public now can save a lot of grief in years to come.
- I believe the previously described permit system would take care of this provision
- There is no documentation that crowding is having a significant, adverse impact on visitor satisfaction. Limiting use in some areas may, in fact, have a negative impact on user satisfaction. See additional comments for section 5. In the absence of any documented need for establishing a carrying capacity, this alternative represents an incredible waste of scarce resources. (Comment repeated for 5.A.3-5.A.11)
- this a subjective figure that will make everybody mad.
- No studies indicate that this is a concern except to a few who want the Seashore to themselves. With 2.5 million visitors a year it is not reasonable to expect a wilderness experience.
- Many families and friends park their cars and get on the beach via piling in the back of a friend ORV. Implementing a carrying capacity isn't easily enforceable and would only encourage people to take MORE trips up and down the beach to get people, doing nothing but increasing congestion.

### **5.A.3 Establish an ORV carrying capacity for heavy use areas at the Seashore.**

#### **May Be Effective**

- Only on a temporary basis if absolutely necessary
- may be necessary for heavy usage areas and dates. Ramp 4 , ramp 43 44 49

#### **Not Effective**

- No criteria to define the carrying capacity
- This really doesn't meet any objectives directly.
- People would make multiple trips.

- Labor intensive and complicated to manage
- People that choose to enjoy areas that are congested shouldn't be prohibited from doing so. It is not preferable that an entity that likely does not choose to travel to congested areas, make that decision for them. This would harm the local economy. The areas are congested for a reason.
- Again, this is subjective. We do not limit the number of umbrellas or chairs or people, for that matter. If too many people are at a place, the others will go somewhere else.
- Would this be done for pedestrian access areas also?
- This might mean that if a large group/organization wanted to have a get together at the beach, that either many of their people could not be accommodated or that no one else would get to use the beach that day. Again a lot of unhappy visitors to the Park.

**5.A.4** Develop indicators for determining an ORV carrying capacity for the Seashore.

**Definitely Effective**

- A must action if resource management proceeds under NPS mandates.
- This will be difficult. Here you would be setting up standers that exist in few places, if any, that would determine the fate for many beach users.
- Without public agreement on the indicators, establishing ORV carrying capacities would be a political exercise.
- Better have some type of guidelines and someone to oversee the nps.

**May Be Effective**

- Only to see if there is any merit in a capacity limit.
- Get input from locals if you do this.
- Carrying capacities need to be established quickly and in place at the onset of an ORV plan.

**Not Effective**

- ORVs have weight limits already.

**5.A.5** Determine how many vehicles could fit at a certain beach and restrict further beach access once this number is reached.

**May Be Effective**

- Beaches change too much to do this, plus who and what defines the maximum amount of vehicles.
- Get input from locals if you do this.
- It would have to be somewhat arbitrary, but it might work. Maybe worth a try at Oregon Inlet or some other heavily used area.
- This could be necessary Memorial day/July 4<sup>th</sup>/Labor Day around the heavy areas
- Most beaches are not suitable for any ORVs.

## Not Effective

- Does not appear to be resource based, but design based (how many vehicles “fit” on a certain beach.
- Enforcement of this would be costly and is not necessary. The users tend to self-regulate and control this by changing their destinations for outings when the intended area is congested.
- Have never -ever - experienced a situation where I felt the number of vehicles had to be limited for either safety or "quality of experience" reasons. Period.
- Would need additional personnel to keep track of vehicles. This money can be better spent elsewhere
- Difficult to manage. Would require manpower at each access ramp, etc.
- Really not possible. Beach changes, size of vehicles, how they park, tides, moon phase.
- This is way too simple. It is not just a matter of how much space there is for vehicles. What about impacts to resources? Maybe even 1 vehicle is too much in a certain area.
- Time consumption that is inappropriately placed. Cost prohibitive, enforcement prohibitive. Work toward derived recreational value of the resource vs a study to prohibit use.

**5.A.6** Limit numbers such that ORVs can be parked on the beach in a single row for safety reasons. For example, if up to 21 ft. of space were allowed per vehicle (21:1), which is sufficient for most vehicles to open doors on both sides and still have room between vehicles, a one mile section of beach could hold approximately 250 vehicles parked one deep perpendicular to the beach. The ratio (21:1) could differ for high use areas and lower use areas. The capacity of an area could vary based on the current amount of beach accessible to beach driving, which may vary due to closures.

## May Be Effective

- Not necessary in most areas
- If the same party is parked behind each other would not cause a problem.
- Its utility will depend on how solid the agreement is on the criteria used to develop the numbers. It also needs to take into consideration the non-ORV types who may also be on any given stretch of beach
- What ever capacity you would determine. The way I feel about it would be to move on and find a less crowded section of beach. When the point gets crowded I move north or south depended on the wind. Have the Hatteras inlet opened up better would take some of the pressure off of the point. The last few years I have used the northern beaches from Avon north.
- It is common at the Point to be 2-5 deep and is not a problem
- The would only be effective if at the same time monitoring was instituted for say 3-5 years to determine if the standard was correctly applied.
- First, I agree with an overall standard of 21:1 or 250 vehicles per mile throughout the seashore.
- Second, I strongly disagree with the premise of the final statement. The carrying capacity for any are should be the maximum number of users possible without doing unacceptable damage to the beach. Once this is determined it should never vary. If the capacity number is less than the max, this sould be an attempt to prevent public use of an area that should be open to the public and would in my opinion be opposed to the mandate of a natural park unit.

## Not Effective

- Congestion tends to be self limiting.
- Safety reasons? Beach too narrow? 5.A7 is a better option, if fish are in a particular area limits would prohibit fishermen from getting to them
- Trying to designate how to line up and park is near impossible. Some people move due to tides. Some due to fish or lack of. This would be okay if the beach was set up like a parking lot with lines and everything.
- do not limit the numbers its crazy its our beach we pay taxes for you guys to uphold the laws and provide our security
- go to the point in the early spring and fall and see how the fishermen deal with parking. I have never seen an argument or an accident but I have seen like-minded adults and children enjoying their favorite pastime. will this parking slot extend to the water line so you only have x-number of anglers on the beach and in their slot? this slot limit will kill surf fishing in the spring and fall and will create more problems that you think they may solve. i.e. hey man, your in my space, I don't have but 19 ft here.
- What happens when a multiple group of cars/persons wants to party in one spot and only one in 5 or so can get access? Any kind of limitation would impact at least one user group.
- Why limit the beach to 1 deep parking? Many times I park and spend my time many miles from the parking spot as I walk the beach, Why should I be denied access just because I don't have a waterfront parking spot which I'm not using for enjoyment anyway.
- May be desirable objectives for a variety of reasons, but too complex to use or manage without voluntary persuasion and must be resource based not design based.
- In certain areas that have wide flat beaches, a single row, one deep would be restrictive.
- People that choose to enjoy areas that are congested shouldn't be prohibited from doing so. It is not preferable that an entity that likely does not choose to travel to congested areas, make that decision for them. This would harm the local economy. The areas are congested for a reason. Is the NPS going to paint parking spaces on the beach? Are people going to be required to measure the distance to the vehicle next to them? Does anyone really believe that if only 250 vehicles are allowed on a mile stretch of beach that they would be evenly distributed along that mile section?
- Heavy use areas very with the time of day, season and weather are also drivers for these use areas. Family groups and friends cluster into tight groups with vehicles positioned to shield from wind and the elements. Carrying capacity is inappropriate and is not practical, necessary or enforceable currently due to the lack of staffing and funding. More law enforcement visibility is needed at the heavy use area at all times to preclude problems. The issue with parking does not need to be restricted but can be managed and handled thru education and awareness. Also peer pressure, and coaching by law enforcement can improve this.
- There should be regulations that do not allow the beach to be blocked by any vehicle, but no carrying capacity should be set.
- In over 40 years ORV operators have, with very few exceptions, been reasonable, courteous and safety conscious. It is only in the face of increasing "closures" that certain areas have become crowded during peak use periods in my experience - and this is a more recent occurrence.
- Family groups often park together, some more than 1 deep. Cars are parked at times to break the wind
- Not necessary or appropriate. Many families and fishermen park the ORV to act as a wind block. More than 21' is needed to set up for fishing.
- 21-1 ratio is not needed for vehicles

- This is a non starter from the beginning. The premise is wrong. The numbers you have put up are too limited. At the Point we park much closer & are not crowded at all
- Absolutely unnecessary. There is ZERO reason to limit access to the Seashore. I have been coming to this beach since 1976 several times a year and have never witnessed an event or ever had reason to believe there is a need to limit the number of people that can enjoy the beach. There is literally miles and miles of beach, what could possible be the need to limit the people who can enjoy it at any one time
- This is an unrealistic carrying capacity for protecting even the most basic natural elements of the national seashore.
- So if a larger family wants to be at the beach, they can't park in a circle and enjoy that time? Or if someone wants to let their kids play at the point in the natural pond that forms, the couldn't without parking at the water line in a row? Doesn't really make sense
- I am not sure what this problem is. The operators will not park if it is too crowded. We aren't limiting the number of fishermen in the same space.
- This doesn't make sense as it would apply at inlets and the point since the linear space on a convex radius gets longer as you move out from the center. (simple English: there is more space than this at the point and the inlets for fishing)
- Your premise is wrong. The numbers you have stated are too limited. At the Point we park much closer and are not crowded at all. What's wrong with parking 2-3, etc. deep? Vehicles are usually staggered so vehicles can get out, and if someone is closed in, all they have to do is to nicely ask to be let out and they are most usually accommodated. If the beach is deep and wide, why not park 2, 3 or more deep?
- As to parking one ORV ever so many feet, remember that many times that 2 or more ORVs go on the beach together. Families in 2 ORVs for example. They like to put ORVs close to each other as they enjoy the beach. Sometimes putting ORVs side to side or back to back provides protection against the wind. So, a hard ruling requiring distance between ORVs would not be effective. I was in Park this past November when the largest surf fishing tournament in the world was in process. The Park had areas from Ramp 23 to Hatteras Inlet that were 'reserved' for tournament use. You can get the numbers from the club that sponsored the event (you probably already have them). My point is, there were a lot of ORVs on the beach for a 3 day period. I did not fish in the tournament. However, I found that there was plenty of room for me to fish within the areas that were marked off for the tournament. I fished between tournament folks for 3 days and never had a space problem. Yes it was November, but the weather was really nice and there were a lot of ORVs around. But, plenty of space. Plenty of space.

**5.A.7** Allow for more capacity in certain areas. For example, designate Cape Point a sport fishing area and allow cars to park two deep. Users in this area would expect it to be crowded and could go to a lower capacity area for other uses.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Have you thought that this is exactly the case in all congested areas! You don't need to go through the exercise of carrying capacities or limits for a particular area. People will spread out, just allow them the freedom (areas) to spread into. Again think about how this will increase the need (and cost) for enforcement personnel.

### **May Be Effective**

- People do that themselves now.
- Any for of site-specific limitation will likely be a nightmare to administer and a terrible enforcement problem. I would try to avoid it if at all possible.
- Just designating this area will reduce people. I saw to many small kids swimming out to sand bars at the point. Someday disaster will occur. Also kite boarders going back and forth in front of fisherman within casting

distance is also a problem. Keeping charter boats off Cape Point by 500 yards would also be an improvement. Cape point is not a place to take small kids and play in the water all day.

- More analysis is needed for 5A.6, 5.A.7. Cape Point is a good example. I have spent many days here when parking was two deep, without seeing any problems. Generally the area accessed is in a high overwash area that changes shape and location dramatically in a matter of weeks if not days. The historic crowded parking is not affecting the resource and, based on personal observations, is not unsafe.

### **Not Effective**

- I don't think in any example a parking regulation other than stay on designated beaches for ORV use.
- Must be resource based – how many adversely impact resources at the sites in question – temporal and spatial requirements.
- This is how it works now. If you want more space you go somewhere other than the Point.
- There is no need to designate certain areas anywhere along the shore as sport fishing only. All diverse users have been cohabiting well for 60+ years. Folks naturally self regulate this when conflicts arise.
- this area capacity fluctuates all day
- If there is a Blue Fish/Drum “blitz”, no amount of vehicles will deter others from joining in on the fun.
- Cape Point is a highly fished area which does not require parking regulations
- 2 deep, how about 10 or more deep that would be closer to what would work at the Point
- This spells destruction for any piece of beach that allows it. The National Park Service should not be in the business of destroying a national seashore. Cape Point is one of the most delicate and rare bird areas in the world. Pleasure vehicles should be banned from this area.
- Cape Point is more than just a sport fishing area. Dynamic areas of CHNS have appeal to a wide range of users it and should not be declared exclusive to a particular user group, the ORV carrying capacity should be reduced in the Cape Point area not increased because it is a highly sought after recreational area that is also critical to nesting birds.
- Have seen it 3 deep and it was fine.

### **(No Selection)**

- Why implement restrictions anywhere? Or why designate any certain areas for one sole activity? People that choose to go to Cape Point, choose to do so for a reason, and the reality is, this is the only congested area.

**5.A.8** During special events, limit access to no more participants than the ORV carrying capacity allows.

### **Definitely Effective**

- No special event exceptions
- Once the carrying capacity is reached the beach is full and no new users until a user leaves the beach allowing a new users to take their place.

### **May Be Effective**

- There would have to be a way to notify people before they traveled a great distance just to find out they can't get access.

**Not Effective**

- The beach belongs to every taxpaying citizen not just to participants to a special event.
- Why should a fishing tournament I'm not involved in limit my ability to go surfing? Maybe we should ban all special events in ORV area's and only allow them in pedestrian areas
- Would interfere with event and could affect traditional use
- There can be no special event that should allow destroying a national seashore, even temporarily. This invites lawsuits that should not be a burden to taxpayers.

**5.A.9** Determine ORV capacity based on peak use and reevaluate this level occasionally to determine where this use occurs.

**May Be Effective**

- This would be a good way if a cap limit has to happen, I oppose a cap limit though.
- As long as this info is only used for making a determination of how to handle the additional traffic. I am not in favor of any kind of number restrictions.
- When you do this, you will see that the small numbers you have come up with won't work
- Effective only if the carrying capacity criteria are totally reevaluated to come into the realm of realism.

**Not Effective**

- Not resource based.
- Peak use is beneficial only as a guide to help more law enforcement to focus resources on hot spots. I would suggest it would be better to organize the key stakeholder associations with this knowledge so that can help leverage coaching and have a visible presence in these areas.
- Past peak use was destructive to the resource and unacceptable to some visitors.

**5.A.10** Base ORV capacity on the resource conditions. Determine the level of activity tolerated by Seashore species to determine this level of use.

**Definitely Effective**

- No alternative under NPS mandates. Temporal and spatial considerations will apply.

**May Be Effective**

- I only say that if it's a natural issue close it to all, not limit a cap.
- There would have to be very good research and data that is available to the public.
- I think too much human activity might push wild life to find more solitude.
- Visitor safety and esthetics should also be considered when determining ORV capacity.
- Good basis for sensitive resource areas where high populations of birds or turtle have been historically observed.

- as long as it is decided fairly with no influences by big name groups, political groups or anybody or anything seeking power or control

#### **Not Effective**

- No criteria to define the carrying capacity
- this approach is too subjective. relies on human interpretation of animal behavior which is not always consistent, predictable, or accurately measurable
- I really don't think it is possible to determine the ORV capacity based on resource conditions. NPS cannot determine resource conditions under less subtle stresses.
- ORV should not be in resource area.
- Is a school of fish a Seashore species? Is fishing a tolerated activity?

**5.A.11** Determine an ORV carrying capacity based on the effort required for law enforcement (LE) vs. available LE resources to preserve quality and safety.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- The carrying capacity also needs to be enforceable for the NPS Law enforcement staff. It is already difficult for the current staff to adequately patrol popular spots at peak times. Currently some areas of the Park are seldom patrolled.

#### **May Be Effective**

- But only in conjunction with 5.A.10 above with the lowest number of vehicles determinate.
- It would largely depend on the law enforcement staff available and what is meant by preserving "quality and safety." Very subjective and difficult to communicate to park users.
- A improved focus and effort by LE would be the best answer here. Quality and Safety currently are not an issue.
- But due to lack of funding most of the park would have to be closed.
- for safety and legal reasons only - if the speed limit is enforced there should be safer driving

#### **Not Effective**

- No known LE problems with existing regulations
- If there is not enough law enforcement on site, it is not the public's fault. The NPS anticipate the number of enforcement officers needed and make sure they are provided.
- would be too easy an excuse to limit an area
- You don't do this to other National Parks for hikers and the likes.
- Have sufficient law enforcement resources.
- Most people are law abiding and considerate on the beach
- Seems subjective & ignores that many can police themselves

- no agency has sufficient law enforcement- and likely never will. adequate enforcement requires education of users and voluntary compliance
- Some areas are already understaffed with LE, so this option would seriously restrict access.
- If permit plan is implemented, have some of the fee go to increasing law enforcement
- That would mean ; if only one LE was in the park, nobody could go out on the beach. We do look out for each other and try to keep folks from getting in trouble. When there is someone who is breaking the rules we are not afraid to make the report
- Permit holder must be allowed and encouraged to call in violations and problems
- Personnel issues should not be a determining factor for carrying capacity. Budgets for staff tend to fluctuate according to politics. Law enforcement should be sufficient to handle every single violation, not just some.
- Hard to do, but to be fair an intense look at all areas simultaneously is the only fair way to judge.
- ORV use should not be determined by LE but rather the ability of the resource to tolerate (5.A.10). Sufficient LE resources will always be problem and in my estimation will never be adequate for even the level of use occurring now

#### 5.A.12 Limit or prohibit vehicles at the spits and Cape Point during the breeding season.

##### **Definitely Effective**

- Don't see any other feasible or effective alternative.

##### **May Be Effective**

- If conclusive data exists that this would meet an objective.
- Use resources to make appropriate closures.
- Again this is hard to determine and subject to bias
- Certain areas of the upper beach and dunes should be roped off, as usual, but I doubt that entire areas like that need to be closed.
- Create an ornithology lab on the core islands. Increase bird habitat there. Study the birds more closely in this lab. Collect eggs and incubate chicks to keep them going. Instead of certain groups using their money to get people off the beach. Use the money to create habitat and study birds in those areas already set aside. Build a wildlife refuge on the core islands and create a more perfect environment. Could become a self supporting tourist attraction.

##### **Not Effective**

- Total closure defeats the purpose of the plan
- Cape Point is the foremost Surf Fishing destination on the east coast. Every effort should be made to keep it open year round.
- What if nothing is breeding?
- I don't believe breeding activities and nesting is incompatible with current vehicle use.
- One resource should not eliminate another

- too onerous
- Wild life biologist should determine this not politically.
- Why, there is room for ORV and breeders
- Only if you limit occupancy of oceanfront houses with bright lights shining on the beach as well.
- The current practice of closures is adequate. However, better communication and decision making founded on factual basis and study is warranted.
- Normal enforcement based on wildlife plan
- This is already happening by resource closures
- Breeding season does NOT take the whole beach.designate areas where the breeding is taking place
- Mother Nature made breeding seasons coincide with many species. It just so happens that in April, May & June the fishing in the park is at its best
- As per the Interim Plan, this action is not required for resource protection. Furthermore, this alternative is more appropriately included in section 6, species protection.
- Cape point is your greatest attraction for sport fishing. There needs to be a way to work around this other than closing the whole area.
- Plenty of room for people and animals. We have coexisted for years. Block off the area where the animals are and allow people in the other miles and miles of open beach
- Past closures through seasonal monitoring of areas have been effective in past
- Nothing is breeding at Cape Point anytime. It is all up in the dune flats which are already closed.

#### **5.A.13 Regulate types of vehicles on the beach.**

##### **Definitely Effective**

- Only licensed four-wheel drive vehicles should be allowed on the beaches. Dune buggy type and four wheelers should be prohibited. Rental dune buggies should also be prohibited
- Definitely no four wheelers!!!
- Look at the websites for other seashore parks. There is research out there showing that some tire and even tread patterns are more destructive than others.
- Some vehicles cause excessive wear on the beach such as dune buggies rented for the sole purpose of joy riding. Some trucks have beach damaging tires designed for use in mud.
- 4 wheel drive only
- This is already done. No 2wd vehicles on the beach. No motorcycles, ATVs, or jetskis.

##### **May Be Effective**

- I think anything that is legal on the road should be legal on the beach.

- Maybe ban the use of trailers on the beach.
- Not big issue in my mind – 2 wheel drive vehicles have to be advised to stay off beach while 4 wheel drive vehicles are required. Not size, but numbers are the issue.
- The only type that should be out there is 4x4's
- Effective only if regulations include noise, proven experience of the operator.
- ATVs seem to cause more than their share of problems re: violation of nesting areas
- State licensed vehicle – as long as it is not a tractor trailer. Could have a max. length
- I suggest that a few more strict requirements be added to vehicles allowed on the beach. ORV's must be equipped with four wheel drive. (This excludes the dune buggies used by some and even now rented by a business within the seashore.) ORV's cannot have more than a 6 inch lift kit. (This excludes many of the trouble makers and abusers on the beach.) Tire size should be oversized but cannot be over a 325 width and non-aggressive type tire. (This requirement goes hand in hand with the 6 inch lift maximum that again gets rid of the "monster" type" vehicles and again gets rid of most of the abusers.
- Some check should be done to ensure that vehicles are free from leaks and safe to drive off-road if needed.
- Probably wise to keep current ban on ATV's
- Should consider different off-road vehicles, for example 4-wheelers like the turtle patrol.
- Only state licensed 4 wheel drive vehicles should be allowed on beach. The superintendent would have authority to allow non-four drive wheel drive on beach if the ORV is shown to be operable on the beach and not a safety hazard. If a vehicle on the beach is shown to be a safety hazard, the superintendent will have right to remove vehicle from the beach

#### **Not Effective**

- WOULD BE VERY EASY ONCE IMPLEMENTED TO SAY NO 4 WHEEL VEHICLES ON THE BEACH
- Aren't ORVs all essentially the same with four-wheel drive? Does NPS really want to make distinctions between Jeeps and Hummers?
- Not enough information to determine effectiveness
- This is already in place, only licensed vehicles are allowed
- Street legal 4x4 should be only vehicle type restrictions
- If the ramps are designed right, the ramp will regulate what makes it out to the beach. As I have said, soft sand at the beginning of the ramp will keep out the ORVs that do not belong on the beach.

**5.A.14** Provide the ability to adjust an established ORV carrying capacity as the Seashore becomes more crowded.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Contingent on sufficient scientific data being available to make such decisions, but unlikely data will be available to insure best management practice for species protection.
- Only through a defined process with public comment & approval

## **Not Effective**

- The beach should remain open to everyone.
- Who decides will it be consistent?
- Again only stepped up law enforcement is needed.
- If this could so easily be adjusted, what was the point to begin with?
- I think this is what is called “adaptive management,” and insofar as it relieves NPS of going through a new regulatory process I do not agree with it. To the public it will appear arbitrary and capricious. It doubt it can succeed in the face of a serious legal challenge.
- Capacity questions are not really relevant as they could never be enforced. The last thing needed here or anywhere else are more laws that cannot be enforced. The current system, when properly enforced, works beautifully!!!! That is something of which no one should lose sight.
- The carrying capacity does not depend on the number of vehicles
- There is no documentation that crowding is having a significant, adverse impact on visitor satisfaction. Limiting use in some areas may, in fact, have a negative impact on user satisfaction. See additional comments for section 5. In the absence of any documented need for establishing a carrying capacity, this alternative represents an incredible waste of scarce resources.
- Severe restrictions and permits should be effective year-round. The natural resources are no less valuable and vulnerable in winter.
- Carrying capacities should be set according to resource, safety and esthetic conditions.
- Again, it not only how many vehicles can we cram on the beach. This implies that as the Seashore becomes more crowded, the park would adjust (increase) the carrying capacity. The carrying capacity should not change much because there will never be more space and hopefully there will, someday, be more breeding pairs of birds and nesting sea turtles.

**5.A.15** Issue night fishing permits for a limited number of consecutive nights in any one area.

## **Definitely Effective**

- May be effective, but when the fish are biting it's awful hard to leave.

## **May Be Effective**

- Complex to enforce – must be resource based under species specific temporal and spatial conditions with sufficient enforcement availability to control.
- There should be management tools in place that insures all visitors' equal recreational opportunities.

## **Not Effective**

- The beaches belong to the everyone 24 hours a day/ 365 days per year. There should be no set hours, or night permits required.
- No night fishing bans, no beach closures at night.
- Most people fish during the day. However I am one that will fish nights. I would hate to see this happen.

- So I'll have to buy a permit to "day" fish and "night" fish? Two permits?
- issue permits and let people fish
- Until you address night light pollution from ocean front houses there is no need to issue night fishing permits
- This is not necessary. Users already know certain areas are better than others. Users self regulate this already.
- Could cause unpredictable and sporadic use, causing more interference with nesting species
- If animal or plant species are not affected, why permit night fishing?
- Night fishing is conducted year round in all parts of the park as well as Pea Island Refuge.
- There are never a lot of night fishermen
- This is another bad idea. The best fishing is in the dark hours. We are used to trucks 10 deep at certain times with no problems.
- There is no justification for implementing permits for night fishing in terms of carrying capacity. The number of visitors that engage in this activity is relatively small. That is, there is no documentation that crowding is having a significant, adverse impact on visitor satisfaction. Limiting use in some areas may, in fact, have a negative impact on user satisfaction. See additional comments for section 5. In the absence of any documented need for establishing a carrying capacity, this alternative represents an incredible waste of scarce resources.
- If I live at Buxton do I have to get a fishing permit each week? If I have 5 consecutive nights multiple times per year on my seasonal permit, is someone going to punch it each nite?
- Only the serious fisherman are there at night. Vacationers leave at 5 pm and do not come on the beach until 10 pm
- Are creating another permit with all the attendant problems with permits and multiple permits and are creating enforcement issues. This proposal also does not necessarily solve any problems. Fishing on consecutive nights do not hurt anything if no protected species in the area and no law enforcement problems. Should address specific problems with specific solutions and no blanket solutions.
- I don't understand why night ORV users should be limited more than day users. IF there is a problem with following the rules, then more LE personnel should be in place at night than in the daytime to be sure the rules are followed. Would you limit passive users for night use? One can not walk down the beach after midnight? Of course not. So, why limit night ORV use? Does the issue at question imply that more abuse is happening at night? If so, more LE personnel should be put into place until the problems are resolved. Enforcement of current rules in place should solve any issues here.

## **5.B. Sanitation/Waste Management**

### **5.B.1 Evaluate dumpster locations and provide predator-proof dumpsters.**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Yes. But dumpsters everywhere are not necessary and reduce the pristine views.
- We have needed this for some time.
- Providing waste disposal is consistent with the Mission 66 statement..

### **5.B.2 Evaluate portable toilet locations and provide portable toilets at high use ORV access ramps.**

### **Definitely Effective**

- Highly desirable requirement
- Or permanent stations
- Oh please do this. It has been long needed.
- Providing waste disposal is consistent with the Mission 66 statement..

### **May Be Effective**

- Only in limited scope. Every ramp does not need porta Johns.
- trouble is this is the beach, storms can and will roll in at any time with disastrous results

### **Not Effective**

- Portable toilets are eyesores and often not used for the intended purpose.
- Portable toilets should be kept to a minimum. ORV users should leave the beach or carry devices to deal with personal sanitation that keeps sewage out of the Park's ecosystem.
- I don't want more structures of any kind in the undeveloped areas of the park.

**5.B.3** Provide dumpsters and restroom facilities only in developed areas (e.g., adjacent to parking lots) and not at trail heads or boat launch areas.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Yes protect the rustic green space by not over doing the porta johns.
- What, folks who launch small boats don't go to the bathroom? Please. Folks who walk the trails & those who use small boats also generate trash. You know what happens when that happens.
- In the public access areas in the village
- Need to include boat launch areas. These are very high traffic areas. Besides, after a day on the water you need to have a toilet available somewhere. Most small boats don't have them on board.

### **May Be Effective**

- Boat launch areas may be useful
- Boaters and hikers also create trash

### **Not Effective**

- provide at boat launch areas
- What's wrong with hikers and boaters
- It would more sanitary that than performing bodily functions in the sand.
- Believe it necessary to provide equal facilities to both vehicle based use, and pedestrian use areas eg. All developed areas.

- Trail heads and boat launch areas would benefit from adequate sanitation and waste disposal options.
- I think you still have to consider other uses at the Park and take care of those needs.

#### **5.B.4 Relocate dumpsters, portable toilets and fish cleaning tables away from sensitive resource areas.**

##### **Definitely Effective**

- This would be an important way to protect sensitive species from raccoons, gulls and feral cats.
- Seems a minimal requirement for many reasons
- Dumpsters can provide “bait” for predators. Move them.

##### **May Be Effective**

- If dumpsters are in harms way then yes. Same as with toilets. But I don't think you need many because most people will not leave the beach to pee.
- Only on a very limited demonstrated need basis.
- Facilities now available are nice and to add some in future when money or grants by local government can be secured it is great idea. You may want to screen in fish cleaning areas to prevent predators from being in area.

##### **Not Effective**

- Right now, where they placed are they in a sensitive resource area? I doubt it. If anything there need to be tables dumpsters and porta-potties at all the heavy use ramps.
- Resource sensitive areas are probably the most critical areas for adequate sanitation and waste disposal options.

#### **5.B.5 Implement a trash cleanup plan and educational program.**

##### **Definitely Effective**

- This should be standard operating procedure NOW !
- Duplicates NCBBA's efforts
- Advise visitors of the recycling program provide by some of the villages
- “Adopt a Beach” programs would be good.

##### **May Be Effective**

- People know they are not supposed to litter. Why develop an "educational" program that will cost money? Enforce littering programs with fines.
- Leverage community stakeholders to support this.
- Local clubs do this already

##### **Not Effective**

- JUST EMPTY THE DUMPSTERS! WHY DOES THAT REQUIRE A PLAN?!?

- Various clubs already provide this service several times per year. The only way the park would need to commit resources to this endeavor would be if clubs stop providing this resource.

**5.B.6** Initiate a “trash-free” Seashore program (Leave No Trace), such as used at the C&O Canal and other parks.

**Definitely Effective**

- This should be standard operating procedure NOW !
- Discarded fishing bait and food should not be inadvertently feed to wildlife.

**May Be Effective**

- Strategic placement of trash dumpsters is a minimum service the park should offer.
- Trash free should be the goal. There needs to be plan for what storms bring to the beach. I am not sure I like the sound of leave no trace, especially if it means things like tire tracts.
- Effective only if violations carry fines and revocation of privileges..

**Not Effective**

- This only results in trash in the park
- The Potomac River bank near Fletcher's Boathouse and the C&O Canal is a joke trash wise.
- educate those few who don't currently comply
- only if you station a ranger at each ramp all day long to hand out littering tickets. I never use NPS trash cans yet see them overflowing with beer bottles and bait all the time. Leave no tr
- This could be effective depending upon the amount of resources needed to implement the alternative. In no case should resources required for basic services such as maintenance and enforcement be diverted to this activity.
- Those of us that us the beaches at the Seashore, already practice Leave No Trace. Most trash/debris that would be considered “litter” washes up in storms and strong tides.

**5.B.7** Provide a mechanized on-site waste disposal system, such as grinding, at all fish cleaning stations to replace trash cans. Provide the infrastructure to get the waste into the disposal system so fish waste is not put into trash cans or dumpsters or discarded into the environment.

**May Be Effective**

- High cost
- People have to use them. That's the problem now.
- Sounds basically like a good idea, but what sort of visual intrusion might it be?
- Fish waste could be 'discarded' into the environment to the benefit of other fish
- This would cut down on dumpster raiders and smell, it would also help folks make less mess. Vandalism could be a problem.
- Since the villages were allowed to remain within the Seashore boundary to provide visitor services, why not have the tackle shops or other business provide fish cleaning stations to visitors. After all, they sell them the bait and tackle to go fish, so they should help the park by being responsible for the results of the fishing.

### **Not Effective**

- Would be expensive and high maintenance. Don't believe this is necessary.
- This would deter from the scenic rustic charm of the area and is not necessary. More frequent pickup by service provider would mitigate this issue.
- A very dangerous idea. Someone will get hurt.
- EVERY – I repeat EVERY – Piece of fish left at the cleaning table was Gladly accepted by the birds
- If mechanized it will be broke most of the time due to use and the salt environment
- If the fish cleaning stations are a nuisance, do away with them. They're used by only a small fraction of the fisherman.
- Emptying dumpsters on a regular basis would be more effective.
- less machines on or near the beach the better; most wildlife takes care of the "fish trash" as they do in the :wild". MANMADE trash is what needs to be addressed as a priority
- too much maintenance for nps

**5.B.8** Require vehicle operators to carry a personal waste disposal device and institute a pack in/pack out policy, including human waste.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Only on the beaches. Off of the beaches regular services should be provided, ie parking lots, picnic areas...
- This has to include bait guts and awful . To be truly effective there will be a huge education program needed in the use of portable toilets in ORVs.

### **May Be Effective**

- People will not follow this. Some will, but most will not, public facilities would be a better choice at ramps and access points.
- Take everything that you brought with you back off the beach and if you see trash pick it up. I've been doing that for 30 years.
- If all visitors, including pedestrians, are required to do the same
- They will have to dispose of the trash somewhere if staying a week.
- What would be considered a personal waste disposal device?? Porto potty???...Human waste will wind up in park dumpsters.
- Give access to free trash bags for vehicle operators along with signage reminding them about the carry in/carry out policy.

### **Not Effective**

- Most fisherman carry trash bags and remove their trash.
- Carrying a porta-potty in an orv would not be sanitary and could lead to dumping in unauthorized manors

- A good idea but impossible to enforce.
- Most people that I know already manage this very well. To set forth a regulation in this area is not necessary or warranted.
- Unlikely to be fully enforceable so compromise of pack out and facilities provided would seem to be a better combination.
- This is not practical. However, requiring people to take their trash out is a must. Requiring all vehicle to be self contained is not practical.
- This is more appropriate for primitive camping areas rather than on the OBX where adequate disposal facilities are available
- There is no documentation that human waste is creating any environmental problems. Furthermore, it is unrealistic to expect every vehicle to be equipped with a personal waste disposal device or to expect the park service to be able to enforce compliance.
- Every ORV has to have a port-a-potty? Is somebody seriously suggesting that a surf fisherman taking a leak on the beach is an environmental hazard?
- Make the policy and watch visitors police it themselves. This is not the Colorado River or the Grand Canyon.

## **5.C. Accessibility**

**5.C.1** Provide access for the disabled in accordance with appropriate guidelines (found at [Accessboard.gov](http://Accessboard.gov)). (*status quo*)

### **Definitely Effective**

- ORV access is the only for some disabled persons to enjoy the park.
- Personal licensed vehicles do not belong in passive recreational areas. All terrain wheelchairs for the truly disabled should be permissible. On ORV beaches reserve areas close to the beach for disabled vehicles to park, similar to handicapped parking areas in parking lots.

### **May Be Effective**

- Inadequate access provided for non-ORV use particularly for disabled as well as anyone else on foot.
- Any restrictions on ORV access is in reality, a complete denial of access to the disabled.
- Effective only of violations (faking a disability) are punishable by fines and revocation of privileges. (comment repeated for 5.C.2 and 5.C.3)

### **Not Effective**

- This is not a restaurant. There is no disabled access on the Appalachian Trail!

**5.C.2** Issue a special use permit for areas in front of the villages to allow ORVs to drop disabled visitors off at the beach and then return the vehicle back to the street. (*status quo*)

### **Definitely Effective**

- Yes, most certainly. A safety corridor that would allow ORV access would be acceptable also.

- Not just drop, but stay with them. If this gets abused further action could be needed.
- For short periods of time (no more than a week at a time)

**May Be Effective**

- You will be surprised how many people are suddenly disabled.
- Why have anything different than the NC state handicap tags or permit?

**Not Effective**

- What is the point of then returning the vehicle back to the street?
- Not required there are other means available.
- If a ORV is available let them go to an ORV open area.
- Prior to complaints registered by Frisco Village visitors in 2006, disabled visitors could keep their vehicles on the beach. The park should return to this policy so that disabled visitors have access to any all necessary medical equipment and shelter. The complaints arose primarily because visitors were not aware that ORV use by disabled was consistent with park policies. There were NO documented safety issues related to this use of ORVs. This being the case, a more appropriate response would have been to advise the village users of the existence of the permit NOT to change the permitted activities.
- Hard to enforce. Impossible actually
- My son is a quad. – vehicle has to stay with him.
- The vehicle needs to stay with the disabled in the event of an emergency.

**5.C.3 Provide beach wheelchairs that can be checked out at each Ranger District. (*status quo*)**

**Definitely Effective**

- The availability of such wheel chairs should be publicized more.
- These wheelchairs are heavy and difficult to use in the sand
- Someone should get the idea to add them as a rental item.

**May Be Effective**

- Rent them
- Many handicapped can stand and walk short distance, but not from a parking lot to the beach. Many of these folks are alone. They cannot push themselves.

**Not Effective**

- Inadequate info on such availability – probably more effectively handled by private rental sector and more effectively marketed..
- The government ought to provide access, but not the means. Perhaps beach wheelchairs could be rented from private concerns.

**5.C.4** Retrofit existing boardwalks with accessible ramps to provide more opportunities for disabled persons to access or view the beach.

**Definitely Effective**

- Do not allow the NPS to permit ramps to be built over the dunes and not have them handicap available as now exists at South Beach in Salvo.

**May Be Effective**

- But would not consider this in the highest of management priorities when even existing pedestrian access appear inadequate for need.
- This would benefit disabled people that do not have access to an ORV.
- As long as retro fits are done in the normal course of maintenance and repair work so as not to cost additional funds.
- Boardwalks are the first to go in a washover event.
- This should have already been done at all boardwalks. Many or most of the handicapped have access to ORV transportation and should have maximum access via ORV through designated corridors to maintain access to a larger portion of the beach.

**Not Effective**

- Not warranted other mechanized and passive units technology is available
- This should be evaluated on a case by case basis as it may not be feasible to retrofit all ramps. Furthermore, the number of ramps restrofited may be limited by resource availability.

**5.C.5** Allow disabled visitors to take vehicles into areas closed to vehicles, except resource closures.

**Definitely Effective**

- Yes, most certainly. A safety corridor that would allow ORV access would be acceptable also
- Prior to camplaints regisitered by Frisco Village visitors in 2006, disabled visitors could keep their vehicles on the beach. The park should return to this policy so that disabled visitors have access to any all necessary medical equipment and shelter. The complaints arose primarily because visitors were not aware that ORV use by disabled was consistent with park policies. There were NO documented safety issues related to this use of ORVs. This being the case, a more appropriate response would have been to advise the village users of the existance of the permit NOT to change the permitted activities.
- Great idea for they may want to watch a surf tournament or other event.

**Not Effective**

- No entry should be allowed into closed areas.
- Everyone will become disabled. In any event, the beach if for all of us, not just the disabled.
- I'm not in favor of disabled visitor having more rights than others
- Their vehicles are no less damaging that non disabled persons.

- Treat disabled visitors the same as, not better than, visitors who are not disabled. This suggestion would actually discriminate on the basis of a disability if implemented.
- If others can't go there, disabled people shouldn't either.
- anyone can get a handicapped vehicle sticker
- everyone should have the same rights of access
- Why limit access only to the disabled? How many guests would they be permitted to have?
- This will depend on the permitting system if it is the vehicle then No but if individual Yes
- This invites abuse of the privilege and lawsuits that would burden taxpayers.
- Allowing disabled visitors to take vehicles into passive areas would make those areas not passive areas. Disabled visitors that seek passive areas would not have passive areas to recreate in. There are other ways to provide access to disabled users without driving their personal ORV into the area. Disabled visitors can drive their vehicles in the provided ORV areas.
- Would they go in the closed area if they weren't handicapped?

5.C.6 If passive recreation areas are established, allow disabled visitors to take vehicles into some, but not all, to provide for some completely vehicle-free areas where viewscape/soundscape/ solitude/natural experience have been identified as important to the visitor experience for that passive recreation area.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Have a handicapped brother that was and still is a CHNS lover. Looks forward to going!
- Or at least keep the trucks on the edge.
- There may be “quiet” battery powered vehicles or scooters that could be found. Handicapped access should be provided, but not to the extent it takes away from the enjoyment of the area for others. If a disable person really wants to visit a passive area they should be respectful of the non-disabled person and not infringe on their experience.

#### **Not Effective**

- No entry should be allowed into closed areas.
- 5.C.3.
- Treat disabled visitors the same as, not better than, visitors who are not disabled. This suggestion would actually discriminate on the basis of a disability if implemented.
- Only as last resort to allow access. Access limitation should be eliminated at every opportunity
- No vehicles should be allowed in any of the passive recreation areas.
- everyone should have the same rights of access
- This sounds way too politically correct. I still see potential for abuse of this one.
- You now have areas on Pea Island where this can be done. You don't need more.

- Passive recreation areas are by and large limited to the villages and are by definition developed. This being the case, the villages do NOT provide viewscape/soundscape/solitude/natural experiences associated with undeveloped areas such as Pea Island. Based upon this observation, there is NO justification for limiting the disabled visitor access to specific passive recreation areas.
- Passive areas need to be vehicle free. There are other areas for disabled to drive.
- Single use areas are not appropriate and will cause conflict. When a family gathers & multiple recreational pursuits are enjoyed we should not require movement or disbursement to multiple areas.

### **Additional comments regarding other ORV management options:**

- This questioning is one-hundred eighty degrees away from what should be looked at. The NPS should use every ounce of energy and resources to develop and encourage access. In no case should access be limited without equal mitigation elsewhere on Cape Hatteras National Recreational Area.
- For the most part, the current system is working. Why fix what "ain't broke"?
- Establishing carrying capacities does not ensure a pleasurable experience conditions constantly change as well as numbers of visitors. Administering carrying capacities is costly and of questionable value.
- NPS will need to implement some process to "certify" that a person is disabled. As we have all observed, many drivers of cars having disabled licensed plates are quite able to access the beach without any assistance.
- With exception of 5A.1 this section is not necessary. The fundamental overall problem is with weak education, and limited enforcement due to staffing and budget shortfalls. For the most part the user volume is self regulating because most folks understand the island and avoid the congested areas at peak times. Peer pressure, education, and enforcement are the key. We should Not be limiting use based on some vague or subjective concept called carrying capacity. The towns and developments along the entire outer banks are not concerned with this and neither should the NPS. The goal should be to provide the necessary infrastructure so that the congestion is further reduced by allowing the users to have more choices. If there are more access ramps, turnouts, parking areas that are well thought out and planned then that is the best solution. Any expansion of infrastructure like more ramps and parking, access points etc must be made in balance as to not diminish the rustic, pristine, charm of the island as it is now. That charm is the attraction and makes for a visitor enhancing experience. This section refutes the premise of what number 4 is laying out with education and enforcement. Carrying capacity is not the issue. Waste mgmt issues can be better addressed in the same manner by having facilities strategically located that compliment the scenic view. Not just low cost porta-Johns. Build small wood structure that can be pumped out. As far fish cleaning and other waster streams these can be improved by better storage devices, more service and more frequent pickups.
- The NPS needs to be better funded and staffed to enforce the laws that currently exist. No need to have new laws when the old ones were never fully tested.
- It appears that visitors using ORVs are being singled out as though they are the only visitors capable of damaging Seashore resources. The whole 'safety' idea seems to be some attempt to determine that ORV operation is inherently unsafe and should be closely regulated in order to avoid widespread injury and death. I wonder if the authors of this workbook have ever participated in ORV use at Cape Hatteras National Seashore. It does not appear that they have, OR perhaps they are trying to justify the restriction or elimination of something they do not enjoy or understand.
- Some type of disposal or trash bin should be provided at each ramp. It reminds people that they should bring out what they brought in
- Enforce a pack in pack out rule, as most fisherman already know.
- These questions (with the exception of the status quo) are not appropriate. Heavy use areas vary greatly depending on the weather or the fishing cycles. Family groups park together as a community. Carrying capacities are unenforceable due to the lack of personnel. Simply put, an increased LEO presence would preclude any of these issues and suggestions from being needed.

- A common-sense approach to ORV management issues concerning carrying capacity, sanitation and accessibility must be used. Within the 74 miles of park ocean beaches, the maximum ORV use in the past 12 years is 41 miles. Seasonal closings have reduced this to 29 miles and 2005/2006 resource closures has further reduced ORV use to less than 10 ½ miles. You cannot compress the carrying capacity of 74 miles of beach access to less than 15 miles in the midst of large spring, summer, and fall visitations, without incurring the wrath of the public and confrontations between recreational users. A general rule for the public: if the beach becomes too crowded – move or stop your activity. Seek less crowded areas. Points to consider: 1. Don't swim, snorkel or surf where others are only fishing. 2. Don't fish where others are surfing, kite boarding, or boogie boarding. 3. don't drive where others are sunbathing or playing games. 4. Don't operate boats or drift-fish near swimmers, divers, surfers, or clamming groups.
- An ORV capacity rule would be costly to put in effect. I can see no reason why one would be necessary. A crowded day on the beach is just that. Beach parking rules would be costly and ineffective due to changing shorelines and tides. People come to the beach to have fun and should obey the rules but senseless rules such as how to park on an open beach spoil the fun.
- Portable toilets/urinals in all ORVs is a must. Porta-potties & dumpsters are needed where there is a ramp or parking lot. The idea of mechanical disposal at fish cleaning tables is a good idea. More fish cleaning tables are needed at the busy ramps, 4,23,34,38,49,55,59,70 or 72. As well as dumpsters. Places to dump portable toilets will also have to be increased. Handicapped folks need to get out to the beach with their fishing gear, they should be allowed a passenger. Most times a handicapped person doesn't like to fish in the crowd. They also may want their family to be out with them, the family should walk, if, it is a passive recreation area. Take down the resource protection fences in the fall & winter. This will allow ORVs to help keep regrowth down, and create new low spots for water to collect and feeding areas to develop.
- Limiting the number of vehicles is not practical or, in some cases, even desirable. For example, a run of Spanish maceral, bluefish, drum, or striper at the point happen infrequently. When such events happen they can attract enough of a crowd to have vehicles 3 deep. Such an event is nick named combat fishing. Visitors to this area expect the crowd and I would venture to say, you would have a riot if you tried to keep anglers away from such an event. As another example, during the summer months ramp 49 can be extremely crowded. This is because multiple family units will purposefully congregate in one area to set up a picnic, including volley ball and quates or to create wind blocks from blowing sand. Again, this is part of the experience sought by visitors to this beach. In both of the above examples, the desirability of limiting vehicles is suspect or at least the limits should be different than at other areas. Another problem with limits on the number of vehicles is that this action will create considerable uncertainty with respect to access opportunities and likely result in inconsistency in management. Even if you could define a limit, the park does not have the staff required to enforce a limit. Also, enforcement of capacity limits will likely result in queuing backlogs that will create a variety of new problems and detract from the experiences of visitors that are forced to wait to access the park's beaches. Bottom line, capacity limits will likely create more significant negative impacts on visitor use and experience than positive impacts. Finally, since there is no documentation that crowding is having a significant, adverse impact on visitor experiences, any resources expended on defining carrying capacity or limiting access based upon number of users represents an incredible waste of scarce resources. With respect to sanitation/waste management, the mission 66 statement goal is to provide such facilities thus, this is, within reason, an acceptable use of park resources. Similarly, with respect to accessibility, the disabilities act mandates that the park make appropriate accommodations, thus this is an acceptable use of park resources.
- LETS SEE, I NEED A FISHING LIC, ORV PERMIT, NIGHT FISHING PERMIT, CONGESTED AREA PERMIT, A SIGNED COPY OF THE RULES, WATCH A EDUC VIDEO, TAKE A DRIVING TEST, COME ON THIS IS A NAIONAL REC AREA NOT A WIFELIFE REFUGE.. WITH ALL THE PERMITS AND HASSLES WILL I COME BACK.. THINK SO
- I own a ORV class-c motor home presently and previously used a slide on camper and have for 30 years practiced carry on – carry off including human waste. Most of the time we bring off additional trash which was picked off the beach, most likely deposited there from a storm. There is still way too much ocean dumping, some of these efforts should be directed toward real problems that still exist in the environment that we all enjoy and share.
- This section makes it clear that maintaining the status quo management system carries an excessively high price tag simply for allowing a privileged few to drive on the beach. If anyone is allowed to drive on the National Seashore

beaches for pleasure, they should pay for the privilege and the destruction they cause, including the cost of staff, toilets, fish tables and trash removal. A better alternative is to eliminate all physical amenities such as toilets, fish tables and trash receptacles, and to fine any user who litters the National Seashore, and to raise user fees to pay for a system needed to clean up after them. Consider charging a user fee for everyone, similar to the Wright Memorial Park and other National Seashores.

- I am 55 years old and I have been coming to HI every year since I was 8 . I have had a ORV on the beach of my own for 25 years. I have shown respect for the rules and regulations and especially for the natural beauty with the wildlife and vegetation. I have never done anything to harm the habitat or the beach environs. I am concerned about the government getting involved in a way that will inhibit our enjoyment of such a beautiful place and replace what we know of as relaxing and away from all the hustle and bustle with a micro-managed restrictive environment. If all of the proposed restrictions are put into place it will require many personnel to enforce all of them. That will further increase the cost of a family just wanting to get away and relax with their loved ones.
- Biggest challenge with most of the above is that it is nearly impossible to maintain things on the outerbanks. The weather and environment make it a challenge and any type of “self operated” machinery would be a maintenance liability.
- The carrying capacity example number (21:1) is too high,. The width of the beach is a factor in how many vehicles can be parked on a beach. The higher the square footage of beach the more vehicles the beach can accommodate. When deciding the carrying capacity of a beach the turning radius of vehicles should also be considered. Extended cab pick-up trucks with rod racks attached to the front and back and trucks with camper shells have a larger turning radius and need more square footage. ORVs make high use areas even more crowded. An ORV footprint is considerable larger than an individual. An averaged sized ORV takes up about of 100 sq feet of beach, often this is bigger with cooler and rod racks on many vehicles. The average person takes a few square feet. Less vehicles in an area increases he carrying capacity for all users. High use areas should have smaller ORV carrying capacities with alternative means (shuttles) to bring visitors to the area.
- Objective research into "indicators for determining ORV carrying capacity" should be conducted. This should be followed by a public discussion of how best to use this information to take better care of CHNS. The changeable sign idea I mentioned earlier could be used to effect a voluntary dispersal of ORVs on crowded days:



- The sign at the Oregon Inlet ramp on July 4<sup>th</sup> reads "Large crowds expected over July 4<sup>th</sup> weekend. Please consider another beach. Thanks." If the Pea Island beaches were ORV accessible, it would help out with over crowding at Oregon Inlet.
- The questions in this section are not appropriate for this exercise. NPS neither has nor will be able to obtain the staff and resources to manage this. More law enforcement visibility and enforcement is needed.
- Sections 5A-B Questions: “Carrying Capacity-Sanitation and Waste Management”: 1) Except for # 5.A.1, none of these questions are appropriate, not necessary, or the premise in #4 is wrong. 2) Heavy use areas vary with the time of day, season and weather. Families tend to cluster in tight groups many times with vehicles parked so as to shield the group from strong winds. Carrying capacity is inappropriate and is neither practical nor enforceable due to lack of funding for staff. More law enforcement visibility is needed in heavy use areas at all times to preclude problems from occurring.

- The tendency to regulate is inherent in government structure. I think it is better to allow the carrying capacity to be like water and seek its own level. If people can't get to the water to fish or play they will go some where else. Let them figure it out for themselves not by arbitrary decisions. It is obvious that there is concern about carrying capacity and the park service planners are trying to look ahead in anticipation. I think there is overemphasis on the number of vehicles at the present time and perhaps for the next 5 or 7 years> I don't believe it has a place in the current rules but might be revisited in 5 or 7 years. The concept is in opposition to what the seashore has always meant to me but perhaps in time the crush of population will require this approach but don't rush into it too fast.
- Carrying capacity is a vague and arbitrary term when referring to ORV usage. If an area is desirable as far as resources available (waves, fish, etc.), beach goers will park closely and/or two deep to share the area. Even on open stretches of beach, family groups/friends/like minded individuals will park more densely than any formula for beach capacity could predict. The idea of lines to access the beach is definitely detrimental to the ocean/beach experience and an economic blow to all the villages of Dare County. We chose not to renew our permit for Assateague Island (as noted in previous comments) due to carrying capacity and the one on/one off system of management.
- If capacity limits are to be put in place, publish normal heavy-use times that this may affect visitors so that they can adjust their travel plans accordingly. This would help distribute the visitor load more evenly to reduce the possibility of a visitor being blocked from accessing favorite beaches.
- USE GOOD COMMUNICATION AND EDUCATION INSTEAD OF RULES AND REGULATIONS WHICH REQUIRE EXPENSIVE ENFORCEMENT. KEEP IT SIMPLE.
- I am absolutely opposed to NPS restricting the number of vehicles. If the beach is open, it is open. Requiring Park Rangers to count cars is not what we need them for.
- Habitat preservation and good effort in public education (test the public after programs and issue rewards especially to the young) are of prime importance.
- I object to the term "Passive Recreation" being used to refer to all beaches except ORV beaches as almost all users of ORV's also engage in the activities described in your definition of "Passive Recreation" when on the beaches. Since all the beaches of the Seashore are recreation beaches I would suggest that the distinction between beaches be limited to "Lifeguard" or "Swim" beaches, "Multi-use" beaches and "ORV Multi-use" beaches which will fairly describe all beaches. Visitors may interpret passive recreation as limited to sunbathing and sitting in a chair only. Would all visitors get an instruction sheet giving them your definition of passive recreation? Multi-use is a widely understood term and passive recreation is not. Any workbooks that are submitted run the chance of containing misinformation as the maps presented with the original workbook were in error and misleading and thus any answers based on the original maps are useless. Only the online maps have been adjusted and not those in printed workbooks so corrections made online can not be assumed to have reached those who got printed versions. Even the maps online are still not accurate since some areas are not labeled correctly. You can not depend on any answer relating to the status quo or changes to ORV driving areas unless the map errors are pointed out by the respondent
- Heavy use areas vary with the time of day, season and weather. Family groups cluster in tight groups many times with vehicles parked as to shield the group from the wind. Carrying capacity is inappropriate impractical and unenforceable due to the lack of funding for additional staff. Just determining and setting up "carrying capacity" would cost lots and lots of money and most likely would not make much difference (except at peak times) and would cause many unhappy visitors to the Park. Alternative: More law enforcement visibility and enforcement are needed at heavy use areas at all times to preclude problems/situations from occurring. Porta-potties and dumpsters are needed where there is a ramp or parking lot. The idea of mechanical disposal at fish at cleaning tables is a great idea but probably expensive and where does the waste stuff go? More fish cleaning tables and dumpsters are needed at the busy ramps 4,23,34,38,49,55,59,70 or 72. Places to dump portable toilets will also have to be increased. Handicapped folks need to get out to the beach with their fishing gear, they should be allowed passengers. Most times a handicapped person doesn't like to fish in the crowd. They also may want their family to be out with them. Handicapped stickers or hangtags should allow handicapped persons to use ORVs to get them to their destinations in all areas except resource closures. Take down the resource protection fences in the fall and winter. This will allow ORVs to help keep regrowth down, and create new low spots for water to collect and feeding areas to develop.

- This is a recreational area. Capacity indicators will only result in funds (tax payer money) to monitor this implementation. Not to mention over extending our rangers and enforcement personnel. Turning away tourists, who fuel our economy and locals who pay our taxes and vote is not an option to entertain.
- Has anyone who has contributed to the formulation of these questions/options given any thought as to how they would feel if they drove many miles to enjoy out seashore only to be turned away because of capacity regulations?
- Most visitors and locals know the beach will be crowded at certain times. As thinking beings they have the choice to deal with it or wait until another day. Let's not turn this capacity issue into a "police state" issue.
- Sanitation: The NCBBA holds beach and road clean-ups several times a year. They also hand out information brochures and trash bags during beach clean-up days.
- There are several businesses that sponsor highway adoptions also.
- Lets not develop "stuff" that causes the public to dislike enforcement personnel @ the NPS. Weve had a bellyful of that some years past. It appears that we are headed in a pleasant direction under the current management, lets keep it moving.
- Some of this question were not answered because if you answer the first question definitely effective there is no reason to answer the rest of them.
- If sections of the beach were limited by Orv carrying capacity, how would NPS keep track if vehicles leaving the area which was at maximum capacity if they left to travel up or down the beach and didn't exit the area from the ramp that they entered it. (Where their vehicle was counted). The NPS has a staffing problem at the present time, and it is my opinion that they don't have the staff to administer an y permit system requires additional personnel.
- The limiting of numbers of vehicles or visitors is an arbitrary attempt to ease the need for more law enforcement officers (rangers). The real need is to regulate the enforcement of law and common-sense decisions for a particular time and place and conditions. The parks are for the recreation of humans and the preservation of the natural world these are not mutually exclusive.
- The dumpsters ar a great idea. We need to educate the people to take their trash with them and not to throw fish remains on the beach. The people with pets should have to scoop up after them and keep them on a leash.
- Once again, this section raises issues that really don't relate to ORV usage on the beach. Carrying capacity is another way of talking about a quota systems to the park or a section of the park. We have ample room to accommodate all the ORV visitors we have each year, with the two exceptions of crowding at ramp 4 on labor and Memorial Day weekends. We can deal with those two exceptions and the rest of the time its business as usual, or we can have a tempest in a teapot, and develop a place for those two weekends which would be excessive the rest of the year. Access and trash are 2 separated issues, not an ORV mgt plan issue. ORV users are trash aware, put dumpsters at the ramp entrances. They will be used. Wheelchair/ramps-this does not relate at all to ORV management plan, any more than the Wright brothers monument does.
- A disabled person not used to beach driving would certainly be more likely to get stuck and need assistance than an able body person would. I would not want to see them get in situations where they could endanger themselves or their vehicles
- Please manage the Seashore as it has been for low so many years and leave the politics to those that need comic relief.
- Disabled visitors should have free easy access to the beach (ORVs are a must)
- Free and open access for all. I don't think carrying capacity is necessary to establish or study. Its just not practical with the situation and parking etc. Limiting or restricting ORVs at Cape Point and other spits during breeding season is not practical or wise. It's the busiest places in the summer. Any and all improvement in trach and handicap is a good thing.

- Speedy driving on dunes and through special resource areas are the major problems in my mind and I suspect most of these problems are caused by occasional rather than regular users. The implementation of a permit system requiring a modest fee would eliminate most of the problems. Also, Compromise is necessary in specific resource areas. Narrow lanes even if they are restricted to low tide should be designated through all resource areas with specific regulations to protect turtle routes for the brief expected hatching period for each monitored nest.
- Establishing ORV carrying capacities can only be for the regulation and limitation of ORV use. Establishing a program and criteria to determine carrying capacity would be expensive. You would have to implement the program, administrate it, and enforce or control it. It would be lots of expense to limit visitor use. You will probably end up with some 'UNHAPPY CAMPERS'.
- The seashore is stretched thin as far as man power, rangers, and so on. Baby sitting wheel chairs is ridiculous.
- Limiting the number of vehicles is not practical or, in some cases, even desirable. For example, a run of Spanish maceral, bluefish, drum, or striper at the point happen infrequently. When such events happen they can attract enough of a crowd to have vehicles 3 deep. Such an event is nick named combat fishing. Visitors to this area expect the crowd and I would venture to say, you would have a riot if you tried to keep anglers away from such an event.
- As another example, during the summer months ramp 49 can be extremely crowded. This is because multiple family units will purposefully congregate in one area to set up a picnic, including volley ball and quates or to create wind blocks from blowing sand. Again, this is part of the experience sought by visitors to this beach.
- In both of the above examples, the desirability of limiting vehicles is suspect or at least the limits should be different than at other areas. Another problem with limits on the number of vehicles is that this action will create considerable uncertainty with respect to access opportunities and likely result in inconsistency in management.
- Even if you could define a limit, the park does not have the staff required to enforce a limit. Also, enforcement of capacity limits will likely result in queing backlogs that will create a variety of new problems and detract from the experiences of visitors that are forced to wait to access the park's beaches.
- Bottom line, capacity limits will likely create more significant negative impacts on visitor use and experience than positive impacts.
- Finally, since there is no documentation that crowding is having a significant, adverse impact on visitor experiences, any resources expended on defining carrying capacity or limiting access based upon number of users represents an incredible waste of scarce resources.
- With respect to sanitation/waste management, the mission 66 statement goal is to provide such facilities thus, this is, within reason, an acceptable use of park resources. Similarly, with respect to accessibility, the disabilities act mandates that the park make appropriate accommodations, thus this is an acceptable use of park resources.
- Carrying capacities should be known/determined thru continued monitoring and not capriciously assigned. Capacity issues are only a concern on one or perhaps two holidays each year. Let's not continue wasting so much time on this subject when the proper application of LE Rangers once or twice each year would overcome any problems or perceived problems? Offering different capacities in different areas causes confusion and enforcement questions. Night fishing is a tradition and should not be limited beyond other visitation opportunities.
- Any ORV management plan must strike a balance. It's important to understand the numbers of people how come to CAHA and EXPECT free and open access. This tide of visitors is crucial to the economy of the seven villages that are located in CAHA. Additionally, this tide of visitors shows no side of subsiding. ORV management plans must understand the recreational aspect of the seashore and how to balance it with resource management.
- I would like to see a plan that has no established carrying capacity. I do not see a practical or efficient way that carrying capacity can be determined for a particular beach given constantly changing environment in the Park. If a carrying capacity is provided in the plan I am concerned that this will be abused by those that oppose ORV use and will eventually result in significant ORV limitation. Having said that, I do think the superintendent should have the

right to limit ORV use in a particular area because in his (her) judgment, there are safety issues for the public or issues regarding species of the Park. The plan should provide specific guidelines for the superintendent to follow to determine if safety issues are in deed present or if Park species are endangered. These guidelines should be flexible so that the same guidelines can be used for the entire park. I think this is a judgment call. But the plan should provide criteria (safety criteria and species protection criteria) that will assist in the judgment call. Furthermore, it seems a realistic and practical approach is to have more LE personnel visible in high use areas at high peak times.

## 6. Species Protection

### 6.A. Establish Resource Protection Areas, Closures, and Buffers

**6.A.1** Establish closures for American oystercatchers when a territory is established or a nest is located, beginning March 15. Remove closures when areas have been abandoned for a two week period. (*status quo*)

#### Definitely Effective

- Keep the closures to a reasonable size, 2 birds don't need 2 square miles of beach.

#### May Be Effective

- Closure statements must also have removal statements and time line.
- Overall establishing closures and buffers most often are not effective when it comes to birds. This is because natural predation is a larger driver to fatality and fledging fatality. Closures should only be made for endangered species and removed when the species is no longer present. The two week period seems excessive. The often misused term "Recent breeding areas" has no formal definition based on factual study. Closure statements must also have removal statements. Compliance with ESA requirements must be met but any expansions must also include reductions. (comment repeated for 6.A.2 through 6.A.5, 6.A.8, and 6.A.10)
- As per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate. If any changes are made, they should be to reduce the number and size of resource closures. (comment repeated for 6.A.2-6.D.6)
- What is the size of enclosure???
- I've marked all of the status quo options as "may be effective" because I have never once in 30 years seen any objective information that would let me evaluate how effective the current closures are.
- Closures should be for endangered species and only in place until the species is no longer present. Closure only where a nest is located, not in anticipation of nesting.
- I don't know what the scientific results of these closures have shown. This has been done now long enough, it seems to me, that we should have empirical evidence that these closures are in fact necessary. Do we have the evidence? If so, what does it say and how do we make it a part of this plan? If the objective is to protect a Park species, then we should have scientific evidence that the closures are deemed necessary or at least considered prudent.

#### Not Effective

- The NPS has yet to provide sufficient cost-benefit analysis to prove effectiveness of current attempts.
- Why wait two weeks?
- Encourage birds to nest along Pea Island and other low impact beaches. Limit development. Encourage birds to nest in a less conflicting area with humans. (comment repeated for 6.A.2 – 6.A.8)

- Establish a closed area around a nest/nests only. Although these birds are not endangered. Create habitat inside the plover closures beneficial for these birds. The abandon time could be shortened to 7 days.
- Oystercatcher breeding areas should be off-limits to non-official ORVs year-round.
- Closures should only be for endangered or threatened species per the ESA and removed when the species are no longer present. "Recent breeding areas" has no definition. Closure statements must also have removal statements. Compliance with ESA requirements must be met but expansions must also include reductions. Pre-nesting closures for colonial waterbirds are not required as they are non-endangered per the ESA. Closures should be implemented only when a nest is located not in anticipation of nesting.
- Recommend posting previously used sites and newly created sites prior to the start of the nesting season so that birds can establish territories without disturbance.
- Only when a nest is established. The last three years 50 Oystercatcher chicks have fledged at CHNS, which is more than in any previous three year period. There have also been fewer nesting pairs so something must be happening at their wintering habitat that is reducing their numbers. Wherever they winter is where the added protection needs to be as we are doing a good job here.

**6.A.2** Establish closures in recent breeding areas for piping plover that are adapted to current habitat and physiographic conditions with symbolic fencing on April 1. Remove closures if no bird activity is seen by July 15 or when the area has been abandoned for a 2-week period, whichever comes later. (*status quo*)

### **May Be Effective**

- Should be removed if no birds.
- Follow USF&W recovery plan like everyone else
- "recent breeding area" seems ambiguous.
- Pre-nesting closures for colonial waterbirds are not required as they are non-endangered. Closures only when a nest is located not in anticipation of nesting.
- Establish a smaller closure. Remove the plants around the pond at the point & the brush & grasses between the pond & ramp 45. There is a huge amount of land there that could be made bird friendly. The birds want to feed there, but the grass and weeds make spotting predators difficult. The whole inside area at the Point is getting overgrown by vegetation. If this stuff was thinned out, most of the courting/mating & nesting would move farther inland. This has not been tried yet, but it needs to be. As it is now the birds nesting locations are moving in one direction only. Could this be reversed? Could the beach be kept open the whole season without disturbing nesting/feeding? Find out, clear the area around the pond and all the way to ramp 45.
- What is the size of enclosure???
- April 1 is not early enough at some years at some areas. This needs to be a flexible date that says by this date or before.
- Do not let NPS or environmentalist to heard birds towards crowded beach areas so they can get a larger closure area.
- Recommend posting previously used sites and newly created suitable sites by April 1<sup>st</sup>. Additional protection should be afforded to unfledged chicks.
- Close the area(s) beginning April 1. If no activity seen by **JUNE 15<sup>th</sup>** or has been abandoned for two-week period, reopen. Most PPL nesting occurs earlier in the spring, so this would not be a problem.

- What is a "recent breeding area"? How is this defined? There should be closures only when a nest is located not in anticipation of nesting. What evidence do we have that closures and buffers are effective? How do we know that ORVs effect "recent breeding areas?"

### **Not Effective**

- No. I have yet to see conclusive evidence that the money spent or efforts undertaken at Cape Hatteras is making a iota of difference in the Piping Plover populations. The NPS has yet to provide sufficient cost-benefit analysis to prove effectiveness of current attempts versus monies expended.
- Establish closures where and when the birds are currently observed .... NOT in an area used last season. Do not place a closure until the birds are observed. Birds do not require reserved nesting sites. If it is reserved be sure to put an X in the closure so the birds know where to safely land.
- There is no data or basis in science for these closures
- "Symbolic fencing" - even if no birds are seen? Remove by July 15 or after 2 wks of abandonment whichever is later? How about whichever is sooner.?
- Why 3 and one half months?
- If there is no activity in this area then it should be opened well before July 15th.
- Close only established repetitive breeding areas. Close no earlier than May 15<sup>th</sup>
- Closures should be removed when the area has been abandoned for a 2-week period OR no later than July 15.
- plovers don't always nest same place each year and they can't read the signs telling them where to nest.
- These birds shouldn't be encouraged to move into this area, their mortality rate is high due to weather conditions and predators.
- Do not block off areas until activity is seen. BIRDS CAN'T READ, they will nest and copulate in different areas, at different times. No need to block off areas in hopes they might, maybe go there.
- Piping plover breeding areas should be off-limits to non-official ORVs year-round.
- This is the southern most range for this specie such that closures for their protection are not warranted.
- Due to lack of success rethink current areas. What about habitat change?
- Closures should be for endangered species and only in place until the species is no longer present. Closure only where a nest is located, not in anticipation of nesting.
- Should include all suitable habitat if the NPS really wants plover to recover here.

**6.A.3** Establish a 150-foot buffer around piping plovers observed in courtship or copulations outside an existing closure. (*status quo*)

### **Definitely Effective**

- The buffer size may need to be increased depending on the reactions of the birds to disturbance.
- If supported by research, minimal requirement **if effectively** implemented
- Should also have netting around these birds to protect them from predators.

### **May Be Effective**

- ? Do they stay inside the buffer?
- Follow USF&W recovery plan like everyone else
- is there a correlation between where plovers mate and where they nest? If not, these areas should not be closed.
- It could be smaller or not needed at all. Suitable habitat could be created around the pond at the Point, all the way to ramp 45. This needs to be tried.
- Only if recreational ORVs are excluded from these areas year-round.
- If monitoring shows birds are disturbed by recreation activities, the buffer should be enlarged.

### **Not Effective**

- Let'em copulate within the closure
- 300 feet
- PPL courtship/copulations have been historically occurring within the closures established April 1. Additional closures not warranted.
- Biologists closely involved with plovers have told managers that this is not effective here, especially with so few plovers.
- Closures should be for endangered species and only in place until the species is no longer present. Closure only where a nest is located, not in anticipation of nesting.
- If they are outside the closure, it would seem evident that the closure is wrong and should be moved, minus where the plovers are not at. Closures should be made mobile to adapt to the movement of the birds without enlarging the closure.

**6.A.4** Establish a 150-foot buffer/closure around piping plover nests occurring outside existing closures and expand closures when necessary, using flexible increments dependent on bird behavior. (*status quo*)

### **May Be Effective**

- Do they stay inside the buffer?
- Follow USF&W recovery plan like everyone else
- if the system works as it did in 2007 that is acceptable as long as the nesting sites are under observation and the closures are removed when the nesting is complete. They should be temporary closures.
- An expansion on one side of enclosure must have a reduction on the other
- Again, by clearing the grass & brush on the interior of the point will give these birds more areas to nest, farther from the beach users. Why not try and see if this will work.
- If 150-foot buffer is inadequate to protect birds from disturbance, we recommend expanding buffer in fairly large increments to reduce the chance that fencing will have to be moved several times. This is necessary since the act of moving the symbolic fencing will likely disturb the birds.

### **Not Effective**

- I believe they will adjust to human present and stay within the closure
- This would work if the area was immediately reopened if the nest or chicks are destroyed by nature.
- Require 1/4 mile "use limitations" (definitely no ORVs) around any nest or active breeding behavior (i.e. territory establishment, courtship, etc.) for habitat preservation, until recovery plan numbers are reached and only then lessen limitations as long as monitoring shows no negative effects on wildlife or habitat.
- Not a bird of concern, must have more reason to show concern.
- Closures should be for endangered species and only in place until the species is no longer present. Closure only where a nest is located, not in anticipation of nesting.
- The larger you make the closures the more likely gulls and other predators will attack the chicks. If you make the closure, make it so it can be monitored, a bigger closure is not going to enhance the nesting of the bird, nor will it keep predators away.

**6.A.5** Establish a buffer/closure for American Oystercatcher nests based on the adults reaction to human disturbance. (*status quo*)

### **May Be Effective**

- There are published studies which seriously question Oystercatcher reactions to human disturbance. Look it up
- Might not be sufficient if ORV vehicle lights at night intermittently light nest.
- Each bird is different and this approach makes sense. At Pea Island, birds are approached and when flushed the closure is placed back 50 feet. Resource Management people need to stay out of closures. There is no need to know when eggs were laid or hatch as chicks can be seen from great distances. If you can not see the chicks from outside the closure with a scope then closure is too big!
- But only after the birds are put on the endangered list.

### **Not Effective**

- No sound basis for this closure.
- how can you separate a reaction to human disturbance from some other unseen or unknown disturbance, e.g., a ghost crab or another bird?
- We know that the birds don't flush as much to an ORV as compared to humans. So to preserve the nests, allow ORV corridor, not pedestrian corridor.
- How would this be determined. Open to bias big time.
- Biologists will not be able to monitor enough for this to be effective. American oystercatchers are extremely sensitive to human disturbance. We recommend a 150m buffer at this time. If future research at CAHA demonstrates that smaller buffers are effective, than it may be possible to shrink buffers in the future.

**6.A.6** Establish a buffer/closure of 150-feet to 300-feet around colonial waterbird nests or colonies, based on observed bird behavior, while maintaining the ORV pedestrian corridor. (*status quo*)

### **May Be Effective**

- 300 feet seems to be excessive.

- 150 feet is more than enough with ORVs. Humans flush birds, wild kids, screaming & running through a corridor flush birds fast. Prohibit children playing near and adults playing near or next to enclosures. If there is no room for play, they should go to a passive recreation area that is what they are for.

#### **Not Effective**

- Pre-nesting closures for colonial waterbirds are not required as they are not endangered. Closures should only be when a nest is located not in anticipation of nesting.
- We have Pea Island for the birds. There are too many closures.
- Limit closures to 150 feet in all cases. Enclosures should be only for endangered species. Colonial waterbirds are not classified as endangered.
- Colonial waterbird breeding and nesting areas should be off-limits to non-official ORVs year-round.
- Might not be sufficient if ORV vehicle lights at night intermittently light nest.
- Same as above. Recommend a 100 - 200m buffer (depending on which species present) based on existing literature (Rogers and Smith 1995, Erwin 1989).
- Nest are fine but pedestrians disturb birds more than ORVs. Resource Management people need to stay out of closures. There is no need to know when eggs were laid or hatch as chicks can be seen from great distances. If you can not see the chicks from outside the closure with a scope then closure is too big!
- The Park's protective actions (closures) should not have exceptions such as "while maintaining the ORV corridor." The birds and their nesting need to be protected. Various laws require it. No law requires ORV use in the Park.
- Closures for these non-endangered species are not required. Minimal buffers, 50-100ft should be a maximum.

**6.A.7** Establish closures for colonial nesting waterbirds when a territory is established or a nest located, beginning May 1. Remove closures when areas have been abandoned for a two week period. (*status quo*)

#### **May Be Effective**

- Change to May 15

#### **Not Effective**

- If you allow for ORV passage
- Reopen after one week if no activity
- Areas for nesting will naturally migrate to the passive recreation areas with no or restricted driving.
- These birds are not on the ESA list. Nothing needs to be done. Using the Migratory Bird Act to pick and choose species to erect closures for, is, well, for the birds. Resources can be better utilized.
- Might not be sufficient if ORV vehicle lights at night intermittently light nest.
- Recommend establishing closures at suitable nesting habitat by April 1<sup>st</sup>. Colonial waterbirds need undisturbed areas for courting and establishing territories. Furthermore, least terns often begin scraping and laying eggs in April.
- until recovery plan numbers are reached establish "vehicle-free beaches" (VFBs) starting March 1.

- Closures only after nesting takes place. Resource Management people need to stay out of closures. There is no need to know when eggs were laid or hatch as chicks can be seen from great distances. If you can not see the chicks from outside the closure with a scope then closure is too big!
- I do not support the use of dates, in this case May 1. The Park must protect the dwindling populations of shorebirds that use the park. They do not use calendars and can't read the rules and regulations. The need to have space to do their thing.
- Closures when not in use are unacceptable, and are nothing but gull resting areas. When all the birds are finished nesting the closure should be removed within a week.

**6.A.8** Establish a buffer, based on bird behavior and suitable habitat, around territorial or courting American oystercatcher and colonial waterbirds outside of existing closures. (*status quo*)

**May Be Effective**

- try for alternate routes around nest sites

**Not Effective**

- If no nesting activity then area should be reopened immediately.
- Create suitable habitat around the pond at the Point, all the way to ramp 45. Remove predator hiding areas, by cutting the grass and bushes. The pond is rich with the foods these birds thrive on, and fishermen won't be a problem at all. The open beach created would encourage birds to use this area. Discourage courting/nesting on the north beach(ramp23-34) That is valuable human space.
- Bird breeding and nesting areas should be off-limits to non-official ORVs year-round.
- The status quo is not adequate when referring to recent breeding bird surveys.
- Recommend using buffer distances in literature. If science based study later shows smaller buffers sufficient at the Park, than might be possible to decrease buffers in the future.
- Closures should be for endangered species and only in place until the species is no longer present. Closure only where a nest is located, not in anticipation of nesting.
- Difficult to implement. Expand the 150' buffer around the nesting sites of AMOY and waterbirds outside of existing closures.

**6.A.9** Establish a 30-foot by 30-foot closure around seabeach amaranth found between April 15 and November 30 (*status quo*)

**Definitely Effective**

- Consider year round closures in areas with consistent occurrence of seabeach amaranth to protect the seed bank.

**May Be Effective**

- That area may be excessive.
- relocation may be better solution

**(no selection)**

- define amaranth or use a ordinary word.

### **Not Effective**

- Establish closures where and when the birds are currently observed .... NOT in an area used last season. Do not place a closure until the birds are observed. Birds do not require reserved nesting sites. If it is reserved be sure to put an X in the closure so the birds know where to safely land.
- Seabeach amaranth should not be protected as it is a farmed plant in America.
- Where is any beach amaranth? My information is that none was observed on the seashore beach in 2007. If found, closures could be appropriate. This is not acceptable if the amaranth is intentionally planted.
- Seabeach amaranth growing areas should be off-limits to non-official ORVs year-round.
- This is too much of an area for this plant. Make the size like 10 foot by 10 foot.
- Remove sea beach amaranth from endangered list, it is not native to the CAHA area.

**6.A.10** Establish buffers around unfledged chicks. For piping plover the buffer would be a minimum of 600-feet on either side of the brood and may require expansion up to 3,000 feet, and for American oystercatcher and colonial nesting waterbirds, establish a 150-foot to 300-foot buffer for unfledged chicks. (*status quo*)

### **Definitely Effective**

- Effect if buffers are immediately removed if fledglings are not seen for a week.

### **May Be Effective**

- If a 3000ft closure is established there should be a ORV corridor established to permit travel around closure.
- this seems excessive
- Anything over 600 feet seems excessive.
- may be effective although 2007's results were not caused by ORV's
- 3,000feet two thirds of a mile, is way too much. Again here is a prime reason to open the access to the pond for the feeding unfledged chicks. Clear the grass & brush around the pond at the point all the way to ramp 45. Also prevent overgrowth of similar areas on Bodie & Ocracoke Islands and the southern tip of Hatteras Island.
- Will feral cats and raccoons respect this buffer?
- Establish ORV passing roads lower speed limits 5 mph or less

### **Not Effective**

- Follow USF&W recovery plan like everyone else
- I think those buffer zones are excessive.
- This limits ORV access and is not acceptable. How many birds have survived to date despite the best efforts of the interested parties?? Leave this to Mother Nature.
- There is no basis for this, just guessing.
- relocate birds

- Piping plover only and for a lesser area
- No species not on endangered species act should have protected area. Enforce no walking or stopping in area of nest, but no need for closure.
- Man has already interfered so the nest might as well just be moved to a more secured area
- Limit Plover buffer to 300 ft and max 1000 feet. Buffers of 3000 feet (almost ¾ of a mile will close most of the beaches on Hatteras Island
- Piping plover and oystercatcher breeding and nesting areas should be off-limits to non-official ORVs year-round.
- Closures don't protect the chicks from ghost crabs and other animals/birds that prey on the babies. That's already been proven. CHNSRA is not a good place for plovers to breed. Look at the numbers.
- In many cases, these buffer areas will be too small to adequately protect chicks. Biologists would have to monitor birds 24 hours per day, seven days per weeks to ensure chicks continued to be protected by buffers. Recommend restricting vehicles in areas with unfledged chicks.
- I know of a 3 day old brood of P. plovers who were walked by their parents **4 MILES IN 24 HOURS**; A ONE MILE BUFFER IS MINIMAL due to the need to forage and avoid predation.
- While this may be effective for bird protection, what does it do for ORV/pedestrian access? Since the Park has/will have a BO from FWS, that should be the guide for PPL buffers. AMOY & colonial waterbird buffers should be only enough to keep them out of harms way – no more.
- Only need 300 foot buffer for PP and 150 foot for AMOC.
- Repeated studies (including the 2007 report issued by NPS Mike Murray 1/31/08) state that pedestrians and dogs are 11.7 times more disturbing to wildlife enclosures than ORVs. 3,000 ft. (3/5's mile), is way too much. Again, here is a prime reason to open the access to the pond for the feeding unfledged chicks. Clear the grass & brush around the pond at the Point all the way to ramp 45. Also prevent overgrowth of similar areas on Bodie & Ocracoke Islands and the southern tip of Hatteras Island.
- Closures should be for endangered species and only in place until the species is no longer present. Closure only where a nest is located, not in anticipation of nesting.
- 300' buffer and 150' on the sides of unfledged AMOY

**6.A.11** Close resource protection areas during breeding season. Resource areas would be closed to ORV use during these times. Pedestrians would still have access to these areas.

#### **May Be Effective**

- ORV corridors should be established to permit travel around closures.
- What's the point here? The birds should be left completely alone if that's what's deemed necessary. No ORV's or pedestrians, only wildlife staff to monitor, if them.
- pedestrians should also be excluded
- Closures should be applied equitably to all resource user groups.
- Effective if they remain closed year-round
- This might be effective if pedestrian access was restricted to a corridor and depending on level of use.

- There must be definitive dates on when closures are established & circumstances AND definitive dates & circumstances of when closures are lifted. Otherwise leave it open until birds show up in location(s).

### **Not Effective**

- Follow USF&W recovery plan like everyone else
- Pedestrian traffic is destructive too.
- Resource protection areas need to be closed to all entry, including pedestrians.
- Too rigid...allows no flexibility if no bird activity is observed.
- If no nesting activity is witnessed then the area should be opened to ORV use.
- Not effective unless supported by data and research.
- Do birds know what an ORV is? Does it make any difference to them if a person or an ORV is 150 feet away?
- To close additional resource areas during the breeding season for ORV. Repeated studies show pedestrians and natural predators cause more disturbance than ORV.
- ORV access should not be prohibited, Enforce no stopping by an ORV in the immediate nest area. Pedestrian traffic should be prohibited. Studies show the birds ignore the ORV's and not the pedestrians.
- Harm most likely will come from natural predators
- Many beach studies indicate pedestrians adversely impact birds more than ORV's. See Godfrey, Leatherman, Buckley, et al.
- Humans flush birds fast and far. Humans should not be by the resource closures. ORV's are not nearly as threatening around the closures. So it would be humans at the water, and only ORVs going by the closed areas. No walking.
- As per the Interim Plan the wildlife is more sensitive to foot traffic than anything else. This being the case, it does not make any sense to allow pedestrians access to resource CLOSURES. With respect to restrictions above and beyond those identified by the Interim Plan, as per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate. If any changes are made, they should be to reduce the number and size of resource closures.
- It is a well known FACT that animals don't 'fear' a machine, but 'instinctly' fear a PERSON. Deer will not be fearful of a car full of hunters, but will bolt on encountering a little girl.
- Pedestrians can harm the breeding as well. Do not restrict ORVS
- I feel pedestrians are just as bad. I would rather see the above type of limited access.
- Unless there is empirical evidence that ORV closure is required to protect the species, then I think corridors can be developed to allow ORV use. If pedestrians can walk a certain path on the beach, then so can ORV's. Perhaps this is a time that the Superintendent would determine that ORV capacity should be limited (not closed) to protect the species. I am told that repeated studies show that pedestrians cause more disturbance than ORVs. And, there is a huge problem on the island with other wildlife (wild cats, etc) that raid protected areas.

### **(No Selection)**

- Pedestrians could have access path next to nesting areas if birds are not disturbed.

**6.A.12** Adopt some or all of the interim protected species management strategy actions.

### **Definitely Effective**

- This has worked. Some of the closures are too big and last too long, but we can fix that easily.

### **May Be Effective**

- Only use as a starting point. Concerns and issues need to be managed with all stakeholders' interest in mind including the species.

### **Not Effective**

- The interim protected species management strategy has not provided adequate protection for sensitive species.
- Too inclusive
- Does not appear to have been effective
- All don't require the same protection
- Adopt some, not all. Management strategy needs to be agreed upon by Rulemaking board.
- IPSMP take into consideration only ORV recreational activities, ignores other recreational activities and is insufficient to protect the resource.
- Several aspects of the interim protect species management strategy actions are inadequate to protect non-federally listed species. See responses to "*status quo*" options.
- The IPSMS is ineffective due to its reliance on the Vogelsong Survey & USGS protocols, as well as other incorrect assumptions. See 6.A.14 below

**6.A.13** Use the interim protected species management strategy as a starting point. Identify limitations/concerns with it and revise accordingly.

### **Definitely Effective**

- The good parts of this plan can be expanded. Some new solutions need to be tried; such as clearing the grass & weeds around the pond at the Point down to ramp 45. This will give these birds a non-threatening area to feed/breed and nest or rest.

### **May Be Effective**

- This would be a good approach

### **Not Effective**

- Sounds very draconian
- IPSMP is a limited management tool that caters to the needs of a special interest group (ORV users). It needs to be readdressed with all user groups interests considered
- Several aspects of the interim protect species management strategy actions are inadequate to protect non-federally listed species. See responses to "*status quo*" options.

**6.A.14** Assimilate USGS protocol Option B or C to determine resource areas and buffer distances for colonial nesting birds (for more detail on the USGS protocols, see Appendix A).

### **Definitely Effective**

- That seems to be working currently.

### **May Be Effective**

- May be hard to adopt and then meet other objectives.
- Options B and C are quite different. If C is used, unfledged chicks and nests might not be fully protected under certain circumstances (e.g. not enough room for 50 m corridor while also maintaining recommended buffer distances).
- High cost in time and funds with limited proof T/E species would increase; prefer the 1/4 and one mile buffes noted above.

### **Not Effective**

- There is no clean basis in science for these USGS numbers
- Any options that close or restrict ORV use should be considered.
- These protocols were written by a former supt which called for the most restrictions with zero regard for visitors or economics of the area. There must be balanced reached that allows for the birds and the ORV access. They can co-exists. The current protocols are currently excessive.
- These protocols were frankly written by someone with a misguided agenda. NO consideration whatsoever was given to visitors nor the local economy.
- I believe this was a very rigid protocol set in place with little regard for anything other than Park wildlife— Surely we can do better than this
- These birds are not endangered. When they choose to nest and feed in an endangered bird area, so much the better.
- Use Interim plan as it has approval of USF&W but sea turtle benchmarks are unrealistic since we do not know why sea trutles make false crawls in the first place and many of 2007 false crawls were in areas closed 24/7 to all and we can not control whether we have 8%, 10% or 12% of nests laid in NC. Our nesting conditions here are beyond our control due to the man made dunes which we have to live with and the broad low spits and points which are bad sites to start with and the turtles know this as they rarely nest there.

### **(No Selection)**

- The resource is now in such bad shape that USGA protocol options need to be reevaluated.

**6.A.15** Assimilate USGS protocol Option A to determine resource areas and buffer distances for American oystercatcher (for more detail on the USGS protocols, see Appendix A).

### **May Be Effective**

- May be hard to adopt and then meet other objectives.
- The resource has deteriorated so that USGA protocol recommendations/options need to be reevaluated and strengthened.

### **Not Effective**

- Limits use of park for what is was created.

- Option A- These closures for non-endangered species are excessive in size and are not a requirement by any law or NPS wide strategy or directive. These protocols were written by a former supt which called for the most restrictions with zero regard for visitors or economics of the area. There must be balanced reached that allows for the birds and the ORV access. They can co-exists. The current protocols are currently excessive.
- I believe this was a very rigid protocol set in place with little regard for anything other than Park wildlife— Surely we can do better than this
- These birds are NOT endangered. Closing whole sections of Seashore because one lands and starts cleaning it's wings is just wrong. These birds would benefit from clearing the areas around the pond at the Point down to ramp 45.
- This entire protocol is based on “maybe, could, might, possibly, can, may “ Rewrite it using “might NOT, may NOT, etc then see what it says. If all these maybes are indeed the best science available then we have a huge problem in the scientific community!
- Protection for birds has not been proven and needs more studies.
- Closures should be for endangered species and only in place until the species is no longer present. Closure only where a nest is located, not in anticipation of nesting.

**6.A.16** Assimilate USGS protocol Option A or B to determine resource areas and buffer distances for piping plover (for more detail on the USGS protocols, see Appendix A).

#### **May Be Effective**

- May be hard to adopt and then meet other objectives.
- The resource has deteriorated so that USGA protocol recommendations/options need to be reevaluated and strengthened.

#### **Not Effective**

- Limits use of park for what is was created.
- There is not as significant population of plovers to protect.
- The closures in this plan greatly exceed the requirements.
- Option A- These closures for non-endangered species are excessive in size and are not a requirement by any law or NPS wide strategy or directive. These protocols were written by a former supt which called for the most restrictions with zero regard for visitors or economics of the area. There must be balanced reached that allows for the birds and the ORV access. They can co-exists. The current protocols are currently excessive.
- I believe this was a very rigid protocol set in place with little regard for anything other than Park wildlife— Surely we can do better than this
- Option A & B are non-starters. The whole Seashore can't be closed. Reason has to prevail here.

**6.A.17** Provide the flexibility to “un-designate” and reopen a resource area through adaptive management if it ceases to be suitable habitat or to designate a new area that has become suitable habitat.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- If NPS biologists, USFWS and NC Wildlife Resources Commission biologists all agree that a closure is not necessary in that area.

- Adaptive management is always a good tool.
- This makes sense. Flexibility is the key word here
- Avian resources do not react to set times. A barrier island is a dynamic system with habitats changing geographical locations

### **May Be Effective**

- This must be done based on facts of study and not just as a conservative decision.
- As long as you are not talking about “critical habitat”. That’s an entirely different situation. ORV use in “off season” will keep vegetation at bay so suitable habitat should remain stable.
- If this decision is based solely on the habitat and known biology of the resources, this will work. It will not work, and has not worked, when it is compromised by consideration for allowing continued ORV use.
- Actual nesting activity is key component not just a suitable habitat. Utilize resources within reason to mutual benefit, do not allow increase of natural predators or vegetative overgrowth to turn the park to wilderness with no recreational/economic benefit

**6.A.18** Simplify resource closures so they are easier and less staff intensive to implement (e.g., close west of Cape Point to Salt Pond Road from April 1 to August 31).

### **Definitely Effective**

- A good idea as long as the closures still provide adequate protection for sensitive species.
- As long as habitat is suitable and safeguards to restrict political meddling.

### **May Be Effective**

- This only benefits the rangers
- Resource closures can be simplified and less staff would be required by keeping sensitive areas closed year-round.

### **Not Effective**

- Any closures should designated by the requirements of the protected species not the benefit of the NPS
- easier on NPS staff and more restrictive on users?
- It may be not needed to close all or portions of this area. This is far too broad an approach.
- This is a draconian reaction and although may be simple to manage and enforce it is not in the best interest of the birds or the users of the park. Again natural predators and pedestrians should be the main area of concern and all strategies should focus in these areas. Yes once nesting birds are identified then closures commensurate with nesting species is appropriate not entire blanket type closures of large areas.
- Address this issue on a as need basis.
- This IS NOT flexible, closing this interior scrub brush & grassy areas offers NOTHING to the nesting shorebirds, except predator hiding areas. Clear these areas of vegetation and let ORVs drive in the closed areas during the fall & winter.

- Further restrictions in the area west of Cape Point unnecessarily limits visitor access during the most productive part of the summer fishing season. For example, summer blue and spanish blitzes are, for some, the primary reason for visiting CHNSRA. Secondly, the ability to spread out during such events is a safety requirement. Protection of species while providing adequate access should be the primary use of scarce resources.
- Park service should provide the required staff to monitor this area without closures
- “Resource” closures must only be used to designate bird nesting areas – when the birds are present nesting & fledging chicks. Otherwise it should remain open, at least to keep the vegetation growth down.
- Restricting access is not the answer. The NPS needs to consider alternatives such as creating new areas with dredge material in the sound, along pea Island, and on the south side of Oregon inlet which would be conducive to the plover habitat.

**6.A.19** Establish larger closures for piping plover instead of the minimum buffer so that dawn to dusk monitoring may not be needed.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- that gets rid of the hypocrisy.
- As long as ORV passage is arranged

#### **May Be Effective**

- Should be determined on a site specific basis.

#### **Not Effective**

- Any closures should designated by the requirements of the protected species not the benefit of the NPS.
- Follow USF&W recovery plan like everyone else
- The closures are more than adequate now.
- easier on NPS staff and more restrictive on users?
- If monitoring is not done then you will not know if an area can be reopened if the brood is no longer viable.
- Excessive closures in size and frequency beyond the dictated founded law are unjustified and unnecessarily limit the visitors experience at the park.
- Encourage birds to nest along Pea Island and other low impact beaches. Limit development. Encourage birds to nest in a less conflicting area with humans. (comment repeated for 6.A.20 – 6.A.29)
- Larger closures have not been proven effective
- This would be shirking your duties to the humans who use this Park & pay taxes. The humans want to use the beach for recreation. Hundreds of millions of dollars are spent on this recreation, are the NPS willing to provide reimbursement to all who spend this money & all the merchants who sell to them?
- This takes more space away from ORV users.

**6.A.20** Establish pre-nesting closures (i.e., before birds arrive) for American oystercatcher and colonial waterbirds in previously used areas that are used regularly, if the site still contains suitable habitat (e.g., area between Ramps 23 and 27 and between Ramps 27 and 30).

### **Definitely Effective**

- This should be done for regularly used colonial waterbird nesting sites.

### **May Be Effective**

- That process needs to be reviewed. Closures should be put in place during nesting.
- If you are using the same spots from years before people would be use to those areas being closed.

### **Not Effective**

- Establish closures where and when the birds are currently observed .... NOT in an area used last season. Do not place a closure until the birds are observed. Birds do not require reserved nesting sites. If it is reserved be sure to put an X in the closure so the birds know where to safely land.
- No birds, no closure. Any closures should designated by the requirements of the protected species not the benefit of the NPS.
- Doesn't say anything about flexibility if birds are not using..
- Due to environmental changes last years nesting site may not be this years site.
- Pre-nesting closures are not effective because the birds may nest anywhere and the birds can't read the signs. The birds frequently range outside the pre designated areas and then restrictions increases without a reduction in the prior closure.
- Suitable habitat can be created by clearing the areas on the interior of the Point down to ramp 45. Discouraging pre-nesting behavior on the north beach(ramp 23-34) would allow this beach to be used by humans.
- Pre-nesting closures are unacceptable. Birds will nest anywhere and do not recognize closures. These types of closures will eliminate much of the CHNS beaches to public use. A closure such as described would close the complete beach between Salvo and Avon. This beach area is a popular family use area.
- provide 100' corridor
- The last three years 50 Oystercatcher chicks have fledged at CHNS, which is more that in any previous three year period. There have also been fewer nesting pairs so something must be happening at their wintering habitat that is reducing their numbers. Wherever they winter is where the added protection needs to be as we are doing a good job here. Closures are needed only after nesting takes place.
- AMOY & colonial waterbirds are NOT endangered species & should not be treated as such. If the birds choose a certain area for nesting, at that time the area should be cordoned off with a buffer that reflects the closest one can come to the birds without disturbance.

**6.A.21** Close all resting/roosting and foraging habitats used by non-breeding piping plovers, including soundside wet sand or mud flats near inlets, margins of ephemeral pool or pond habitats, and adjacent upland sandy dune or beach within 50 meters to ORVs and recreation activity.

### **Definitely Effective**

- These areas should be closed to ORVs. Pedestrians may be allowed depending on the level of use and disturbance.

### **May Be Effective**

- If there's adequate proof this is necessary it would meet an objective.

- animals are periodically disturbed by humans and other animals- most seem to have survived for millennia. I think NPS and USFWS are going overboard to protect some of these birds.
- Seems ok as long as it doesn't take away from present areas now being used.

### **Not Effective**

- Non-breeding birds move widely and are not affect by other use
- Follow USF&W recovery plan like everyone else, non breeding plovers are not effected by ORV's
- Species management should not be subject to ORV demands or past use.
- Again natural predators and pedestrians should be the main area of concern and all strategies should focus in these areas. Yes once nesting birds are identified then closures commensurate with nesting species is appropriate not entire blanket type closures of large areas. Excessive closures in size and frequency beyond the dictated founded law are unjustified and unnecessarily limit the visitors experience at the park. Prenesting closures are not effective because the birds may nest anywhere and the birds can't read the signs. The birds frequently range outside the pre designated areas and then restrictions increases without a reduction in the prior closure.
- Non starter. What would be done if the plovers started feeding on the bugs in the puddles on the Food Lion roof in Avon?
- These areas should not be closed at all for non-breeding plovers. Non-breeding plovers may be seen anywhere, any time causing a beach closure
- Too broad. This would deny legitimate access to areas that may or may not be critical habitats
- It would make more sense because this is a highly used recreational seashore that instead of closing more areas in populous areas that interested environmental groups and ORV user groups get together and find least used areas that may now not be suitable for such resting/roosting and foraging habitats used by non-breeding piping plovers and prepare and alter the area to make them prime areas for closures for these birds. That is, it is a known fact that past winter closures have with no ORV use have encouraged growth of vegetation that these birds dislike and caused them to migrate to areas closer to ORV use areas. Close half the section of present closed areas now used and with NPS and volunteering groups prepare the open half to better serve the birds in coming years. These preparations and allowing ORV use in the area would the habitat for closure of this half in the following year when the other half would be done likewise. Then summer closures would be smaller and winter closures would be patchwork opened to allow every (?) year these groups would further enhance the area for following years and all parties are happier.
- Possibly close ONLY those areas used CONSISTENTLY by PPL, not just a blanket approach. ORVs can help with habitat preservation by keeping the vegetation down in opened areas.

**6.A.22** Establish pre-nesting closures for piping plover in suitable habitat used during the last 10 years.

### **Definitely Effective**

- I would recommend closures in suitable habitat that was used for nesting in the previous 3 years. Habitat changes occur so quickly that 10 years is too long a time frame to use.

### **May Be Effective**

- That's a shot in the wind that they may return, I think if there's enough data to conclude this is effective in meeting an objective then it would be a good idea.
- As long as the nesting is monitored and areas opened when complete.

- Perhaps this is a clue as to why nest plover numbers are down so much.
- Provide a transparent means to de-establish such areas if they're not used
- Must define "closure" and "sustainable"
- provide 100' corridor

#### **Not Effective**

- Only close what was used recently.
- This not an exact science
- do it when they arrive
- Protect nests and chicks not birds exhibiting territorial or courting behavior.
- Prenesting closures are not required by the ESA. The NPS must enforce the ESA, but is not required to exceed the standards
- I thought it was a running 3 year guideline.
- This should be limited to the last three (3) years. Pre-nesting closures should not be estimated, but need to be established only when the birds are observed.
- I don't believe that these birds live that long and if they don't live 10 years than this concept makes no sense. Three years is plenty of time, don't need to go back 10 years.

**6.A.23** Establish pre-nesting closures for American oystercatcher and colonial waterbirds used during the past 3 years outside areas on spits/points already closed for piping plover nesting. As more data becomes available, the definition of historical habitat would be expanded, up to a maximum of 10 years.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- That's a shot in the wind that they may return, I think if there's enough data to conclude this is effective in meeting an objective then it would be a good idea.
- Again I would recommend using three years rather than 10 because of the dynamic nature of the habitat.
- Pre-nesting closures seem very appropriate for these species that data already shows return to the same or nearly the same sections of beach year after year, as long as the habitat remains. Putting up the closures before the birds arrive gives them a chance to get settled in THEIR preferred location and not be chased around by ORVs and pedestrians and then have to settle for some left-over space that may not be the best for them.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Established by whom, closures should be flexible and easily adjusted
- Recommend establishing pre-nesting closures in historical habitat and newly created habitat (e.g. overwash fan created by recent storm). Also there is already a good deal of historical data available so might be appropriate to expand your definition of historical habitat at this time.
- Need to define action terms
- provide 100' corridor

### **Not Effective**

- No birds, no closure
- do it when they arrive
- Sounds like complete beach closures to me.
- Due to environmental changes last years nesting site may not be this years site.
- Protect nests and chicks not birds exhibiting territorial or courting behavior.
- Prenesting closures are not required by the ESA. The NPS must enforce the ESA, but is not required to exceed the standards
- Oystercatchers & colonial waterbirds are not on the ESA. Nothing needs to be done.
- There should not be any pre-nesting closures, but if so, this should stay at the three (3) year limit
- Science cannot know where or why plovers do or do not return to the same areas and past studies closures may now not be suitable. 6.A.21 addresses the best method to handle these closures. An example of success is that for the last three years less oystercatchers have nested on the seashore, but fledging has increased. For some other reason than ORV use has caused these birds not to return.
- If a bird has not used an area for 4 to 10 years why would anyone want to reserve their spot, it makes no sense and again the Protocols were done without considering cost or other uses of the Seashore. The last three years 50 Oystercatcher chicks have fledged at CHNS, which is more than in any previous three year period. There have also been fewer nesting pairs so something must be happening at their wintering habitat that is reducing their numbers. Wherever they winter is where the added protection needs to be as we are doing a good job here. Use the Interim Plan guidelines as this is a USF&W approved plan. Don't need pre-nesting closures.
- Allow for 2-3 yr historical asset consideration and possible global warming effects

**6.A.24** Establish a 150-foot buffer around American oystercatcher and colonial waterbirds exhibiting territorial or courting behaviors.

### **May Be Effective**

- Effective for colonial waterbirds but the large territory sizes used by American oystercatchers would make this difficult to determine.
- is there a correlation between where they court and where they nest? If not, these areas should not be closed.
- American oystercatchers and colonial waterbirds are extremely sensitive to human disturbance. A 150- buffer might not be adequate to prevent birds from abandoning sites in areas with heavy human disturbance.

### **Not Effective**

- Do they stay in one place?
- Non-ESA protected species do not require excessive closures. The task of the NPS is to follow the ESA guidelines not re-write or re-interpret them. (Comment repeated for 6.A.25-6.A.29)
- This is normal bird behavior, and does not require a closure
- too excessive, tide line and dune line subject to change any time

- These birds are not endangered. Suitable habitat can be created around the pond at the Point down to ramp 45.
- Effective only if these areas remain closed year-round. (comment repeated for 6.A.25-6.A.29)
- 150 feet is not sufficient protection for most birds, certainly not for birds on the brink of extirpation from the Park.
- Less restrictive closures around nests will suffice. Walking toward a nest until signs of disturbing the nesting bird then using this distance plus 15 ft should be sufficient.
- If you have an unlimited budget as these areas may change and the people putting up the buffer stakes will probably spook the birds anyway. In practice this would be impossible to do anyway as these birds fly around when courting. Again the Protocols were done without considering cost or other uses of the Seashore. The last three years 50 Oystercatcher chicks have fledged at CHNS, which is more than in any previous three year period. There have also been fewer nesting pairs so something must be happening at their wintering habitat that is reducing their numbers. Wherever they winter is where the added protection needs to be as we are doing a good job here. Use the Interim Plan guidelines as this is a USF&W approved plan. Don't need pre-nesting closures.
- The NPS needs to consider alternatives such as creating new areas with dredge material in the sound, along Pea Island, and on the south side of Oregon Inlet which would be conducive to the Oystercatcher habitat.

**6.A.25** Establish a 300-400 foot buffer around American oystercatcher nests.

**Definitely Effective**

- The buffer size may need to be bigger depending on the reaction of the birds to disturbance.

**May Be Effective**

- I think 150' is sufficient, but once fledgling arrives it should be moved back to 300', so maybe starting at 300' would be easier.
- Excessive
- This might be adequate for some birds, but oystercatchers are extremely sensitive to human disturbance and may leave their nests at even greater distances depending on the type of disturbance.
- provide 100' corridor and more access points

**Not Effective**

- Provide ORV corridor. ORVs don't flush birds as bad as humans walking.
- Limit buffers to 150 feet.
- Unnecessary! Look at the ornithology studies

**6.A.26** Establish a 300-foot buffer around unfledged American oystercatcher chicks that moves with the brood.

**May Be Effective**

- I think 150' is sufficient, but once fledgling arrives it should be moved back to 300', so maybe starting at 300' would be easier.
- I think the buffer should be 150 foot.

- The buffer size may need to be bigger depending on the reaction of the birds to disturbance.
- Excessive
- provide 100' corridor and more access points

**Not Effective**

- Why rewrite the guidelines, these birds are not endangered. This size area is too large for a non-endangered bird.
- Limit buffers to 150 feet.
- It will be impossible to monitor enough to ensure protection of chicks in areas with ORVs. Recommend closing beaches adjacent to unfledged chicks.
- This may not be enough. It is my understanding they are very mobile.

**6.A.27** Establish a 600-foot buffer around unfledged American oystercatcher chicks that moves with the brood.

**May Be Effective**

- I don't think it's necessary, but I'm not an ornithologist.
- The buffer size may need to be bigger depending on the reaction of the birds to disturbance.
- Excessive
- Sounds very labor intensive and very difficult to accomplish with available or likely resources. Also a tough sell to ORV users.
- This distance might be effective if the brood is closely monitored during the day and there are additional restrictions on night driving.
- What is their behavior? How far do they move? Their biology and behavior must dictate protective measures, not an arbitrary distance that may or may not protect them from getting run over as they have in the past.

**Not Effective**

- 600 foot is excessive.
- Size of closure needs to be based on scientific evidence of the birds tolerance of contacts
- These birds are not endangered. If 300feet is too large, 600feet is outlandish. Establish habitat around the pond down to ramp 45.
- Limit buffers to 150 feet
- The island is not big enough, HWY 12 would have to be closed.
- I think more studies need to be done on the counting of and survival rate including areas not at The Seashore Park

**6.A.28** Establish a 300-foot buffer around colonial waterbird nests at the outside edge of the colony (if only least terns are present in the colony). Establish a 600-foot buffer from the outside edge of the colony if other tern species or black skimmer nests are present in the colony.

**May Be Effective**

- Size of closure needs to be based on scientific evidence of the birds tolerance of contacts
- The buffer size may need to be bigger depending on the reaction of the birds to disturbance.
- Excessive
- Additional restrictions might be needed when unfledged chicks are present.
- provide 100' corridor and more access points
- Use the Interim Plan guidelines as this is a USF&W approved plan. Use 150 foot buffer at most.
- The closure should be made mobile without enlarging the area that is closed.

**Not Effective**

- This is rewriting of the rules. These birds are not endangered. They don't require that much space.
- 600 feet buffer, Stop nighttime lights from vehicles intermittently shining light nesting/roosting birds at night.
- The largest colony of least terns is at a store in Nags Head, they have to learn to adjust with humans.

**6.A.29** Establish a 300-foot buffer around unfledged colonial waterbird chicks at the outside edge of the colony (if only least terns are present in the colony). Establish a 600-foot buffer from the outside edge of the colony if other tern species or black skimmer nests are present in the colony.

**May Be Effective**

- Size of closure needs to be based on scientific evidence of the birds tolerance of contacts
- The buffer size may need to be bigger depending on the reaction of the birds to disturbance.
- Excessive
- The buffer would presumably be temporary—until the birds flew away. Right? Is there staff to do this?
- provide 100' corridor and more access points
- ONLY if buffer is reduced to 150 ft. – allowing for ORV/pedestrian corridor. These species are fed by parents & do not require ocean-front closures.
- The closure should be made mobile without enlarging the area that is closed.

**Not Effective**

- This is like throwing the baby & bath-water on a fire. The baby gets burned, there is not as much water in the bucket, and yet the fire rages. These birds are not endangered.
- 600 feet buffer, Stop nighttime lights from vehicles intermittently shining light nesting/roosting birds at night.
- This may not be effective if ORV use is permitted adjacent to these areas.

**6.A.30** Close the beach between Ramp 23 and Ramp 27 as a resource area to protect nesting areas.

**May Be Effective**

- Size of closure needs to be based on scientific evidence of the birds tolerance of contacts
- This is a potential compromise
- The closure should be made mobile without enlarging the area that is closed.

### **Not Effective**

- The entire stretch doesn't need to be closed only the area where they are nesting.
- This is a draconian reaction and although may be simple to manage and enforce it is not in the best interest of the birds or the users of the park. Again natural predators and pedestrians should be the main area of concern and all strategies should focus in these areas. Yes once nesting birds are identified then closures commensurate with nesting species is appropriate not entire blanket type closures of large areas
- There is Pea Island and all the beach area already taken by the villages
- this would impair a very popular tourist area, and who's to say the birds will co-operate?
- Bird populations vary each season, as does the weather. Only close this area when it is absolutely necessary.
- For what? Why not close 1-72? Birds are not endangered , they would benefit from clearing the areas of the interior of the Point & the spits.
- This beach area is a very popular family beach for visitors and should not be closed for any reason.
- This would increase the distance between access points to close to 20 miles which is not acceptable. Use a 150 foot buffer for nesting birds and chicks.
- This is absolutely not effective. ORV accessible beaches have been closed through the years so there is only a fraction of the original accessible beach left. The only fair way to implement this would be to OPEN the same number of miles on Pea Island to ORV access if the beach from ramp 23-27 were closed!

## **6.B. Establish ORV Routes or Passive Recreation Areas Based on Resource Protection**

**6.B.1** Designate a 100-foot-wide ORV and pedestrian corridor. Outside the ORV corridor, prohibit pedestrian access to breeding areas beyond the symbolic fencing. Delineate the corridor with posts placed up to 100 feet above the high tide line. In areas of reduced corridor width (i.e., narrower than 100 feet), post a reduced speed limit of 10 mph. (*status quo*)

### **Definitely Effective**

- birds seem to be less afraid of moving vehicle than of people on foot
- sounds logical. This works at assateague
- The corridor could actually be smaller with pullouts to park vehicle and walk to the beach as a pedestrian.

### **May Be Effective**

- ORV and pedestrian traffic should be separated and decisions on corridors must be based on research data.
- A reduction in the sizes of the resource closures would aid in ORV/pedestrian access and still give the birds plenty of room to do their thing. The symbolic fencing is sufficient. No additional signage or fencing needs to be added. Beach users are used to seeing the symbolic fencing and respect it.

- if a 2-300 ft corridor is used or staffing can respond to the dynamics of the Seashore to move corridors, which has not been timely in the pas
- GOOD SIGNAGE IS PARAMOUNT TO EFFECTIVENESS. THE ONLY TIME I EVER FOUND MYSELF IN A RESTRICTED AREA WAS DUE TO LACK OF VISIBLE SIGNS.

### **Not Effective**

- This impedes birds ability to access the wet beach because of traffic and tire ruts. A full beach ORV closure is necessary.
- Management by lockout is not acceptable. The seashore is not a Wilderness area. It is a recreation area established for Public Use. Again natural predators and pedestrians should be the main area of concern and all strategies should focus in these areas. Yes once nesting birds are identified then closures commensurate with nesting species is appropriate not entire blanket type closures of large areas. (comment repeated for 6.B.2 - 6.B.6)
- Need more than 100 feet.
- You are in favor of bird watchers only, very discriminating.
- This works now, barely. The corridor that was opened at the Point to get from 45 to the point when 43-44 was narrow and couldn't be passed at high tide worked As did the trail behind the dune at 43-44 around the turtles nests last yr. Thinking of things like that, is what needs to be done. Putting armed enforcement rangers behind barricades was the worst idea ever to come out of this NPS group.
- ORV corridors have only been used where the dune line is not well defined. This limited application of corridors has proven that it is next to impossible to maintain corridor widths as conditions change. Furthermore, unnecessarily narrow corridors have resulted in increases in violations as users find it necessary to violate the barrier to escape high surf. Bottom line, corridors have proven to be impracticable and to require considerable manpower to maintain thus, corridors should only be implemented when absolutely necessary.
- Increase the corridors to 150 feet
- ORV corridors are in conflict with pedestrian corridors.
- This is not enough to protect unfledged chicks and may not be enough to protect nests with eggs (e.g. if buffer distance to small because of ORV corridor).
- The only corridor needed is one that starts 20ft seaward from the dune to the waterline. Otherwise, you are squeezing users into smaller & smaller areas, creating potential for conflict.
- Any year around closure encourages vegetation and loss of habitat.
- This works now, barely. The corridor that was opened at the Point to get from 45 to the Point (when 43-44 was narrow and couldn't be passed at high tide) worked; as did the trail behind the dune at 43-44 around the turtles nests last year. Thinking of workarounds like that, is what needs to be done to accommodate all visitors. "Symbolic fencing", do you think that tourists know what that means? Why can't string be strung between symbolic fence posts so that there is no doubt where pedestrians can go? Posting a lower speed of 15 mph in narrow areas is suggested.
- There are places which corridors will not and do not work. Just look back at the tern chicks that were run over and killed at Hatteras Spit because the chicks moved outside the protective closures (no, they can't read the signs) and into the corridor. In addition, where there are corridors, 100 foot width may be excessive. As I've stated before, there is not law requiring ORV use on the beaches at Cape Hatteras but there are numerous laws requiring the NPS to protect the Park's resources (birds, plants, beaches, etc.)

**6.B.2** Establish criteria for designating ORV routes where there would be the least conflict with resources.

**May Be Effective**

- I think the current 100 foot corridor is sufficient
- I suggest using minimal rather than least
- Equal effort should be given to designating additional ORV access as is given to determining resource closures. When a resource closure is established, NPS should immediately establish a way for beach users to get around it so that we can use the beach.
- may be since it maintains flexibility if the intent is to bypass closures
- This could work, but would still need to have some flexibility. For example, what is the protocol if an oystercatcher nests adjacent to one of these routes?

**Not Effective**

- Any year around closure encourages vegetation and loss of habitat.

**6.B.3** Close some resource areas year-round to the public for all uses.

**Definitely Effective**

- This is necessary in the most important resource areas.
- If resource areas are determined to be critical habitat.
- Birds need year round foraging and resting areas.

**May Be Effective**

- To keep from having to update and make changes, and allow some untouched areas to exist.
- Vague definition, and seems to be directed to towards total closing of the beach.

**Not Effective**

- No parts of the seashore should be closed year round.
- No reason to do so. Park was established for public use.
- Seasonal closures
- By allowing ORVs to drive on the grass & brush around the pond at the Point down to ramp 45 during late fall-winter would help to reduce this vegetation. This would give the birds more nonthreatening beach to play on.
- This should never happen as the park service cannot determine that a species will continue to use an area determined as a resource closure. It's actually funny to think that the environmental lobby assumes that they can predict repeated usage by species.
- Any year around closure encourages vegetation and loss of habitat which should be viewed as a take. We should be encouraging birds to go to places where they have the best chance of survival. With this in mind it would

seem that the back side of Ocracoke spit may be ideal as it is already closed and would seem to have a greater and possibly better quality of food than any other place in the Seashore. If one or two feet of sand could be added to the western edge of the vegetated flats area of Ocracoke Spit, an ideal area for nesting could be created and this would be a win win situation.

**6.B.4** Establish non-kite boarding zones around resource areas (i.e., have no-launch zones in locations where kite boards, if launched there, might travel into the resource areas). Partner with the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission to establish regulations for kite boarding in waters adjacent to high priority resource areas.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- If zone determined to provide species enhancement

#### **May Be Effective**

- The rules should be the same for all users
- The danger with kite-boards is where they go. The shops have to inform their customers the dangers of sailing close to the resource closures. These kite-boarders & sail boarders need to stay away from the ocean in front of the closures. More than a “no launch” rule is needed here.
- Would need to establish minimum distances that kite boards could be from nesting birds. Would also need to establish guidelines about retrieval of kites. For example, if a kite boarder falls offshore from resource closure, they shouldn't be allowed to come to shore and re-launch, but instead would need to walk their equipment down the beach to outside of the minimum set distance. There should also be guidelines about other extreme sports.

#### **Not Effective**

- mark areas where they should not go and ticket those that don't comply
- The interim plan provides regulations regarding kite boarding activities. It is up to the kite boarder to control their equipment, just as it is up to a boater to know where they may and may not harvest fish. It is up to the park service to enforce the rules.
- Go to these groups (there may be 10 shops with in the park) and educate them on violating these areas and they will self regulate their users and the problem will go away. Violators within the closures should be ticketed and if the problem causes a few of these the word will get out without further rules.
- I know of only one incident where kite boarders entered a closure so this does not seem to be a real problem. If kite boarding is a problem for birds than this can be handled by producing maps to show no landing zones and getting these out to user groups and rental agencies.
- Ask for the cooperation of the Kiteboarding community in avoiding certain areas when there are chicks on the ground that could be left unprotected if the parents were spooked by kite boarders. If the kite boarders continually disturb the parents then consideration could be given to no kite boarding zones, but only temporarily!

**6.B.5** Give more protection to the resource area by reducing the width of the ORV corridor adjacent to it.

#### **May Be Effective**

- ORV corridors need to be at least wide enough for 2 vehicles to pass or adequate pull outs be provided so vehicles can pass.
- Temporary adjustments in season maybe
- What is the width now and what would it be if reduced? Reducing areas available for ORVs will be a difficult sell absent powerful data to support it.

- This could be effective if providing the minimum buffer recommended around nests, but it still won't provide complete protection for unfledged chicks. Furthermore, what is the protocol if there is not enough room for ORVs and an adequate buffer?

#### **Not Effective**

- The corridor is already marginal for ORV users.
- Changing sand conditions and two-way traffic make this impractical.
- you are squeezing and squeezing the human users. decide what is absolutely necessary to minimize impacts on birds and draw a line there
- You should increase the width to prevent vegetation from growing and reducing suitable habitat.
- Not needed. Prevent walking through or by resource closures.
- Corridor should be increased, not decreased for safety reasons
- The closed areas were so large in 2007 that one could not see the birds. It seems to the public that the larger the closures are the less productive that the birds are. If things were so bad here in 2007 and it is thought that human intervention was the cause than why were the numbers also down at Pea Island where ORV's are not allowed and there is little pedestrian use of the beaches.

#### **6.B.6 Limit or prohibit vehicles at the spits and Cape Point during breeding season.**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- This would be the most effective way to protect sensitive species.
- This is probably a very good idea. Most folks can walk. They ones that really, truly can't could be driven in perhaps. I saw many people walking to the "Isabel inlet" to fish and they carried their fishing equipment and chairs but perhaps not as much beer.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Limit and prohibit are two very different strategies. For myself, I would opt for prohibition if the data support such action. If not, policing a limited number of vehicles will be very costly and labor intensive.
- May be effective depending on how "limit" is defined

#### **Not Effective**

- Need to establish that this closure is needed.
- This is a national park for people as well as wildlife.
- Non access is not acceptable.
- Vague definition, and seems to be directed to towards total closing of the beach
- Onerous
- Elevates species needs above human needs in a recreation area
- This is a non starter, period. Clear the inside areas of the Point & spits.

- this is too popular a public area already to cut it off
- Move all the nests and eggs either to an incubator or to Pea Island that is already a wildlife refuge and doesn't allow ORV access.

**6.B.7** Identify areas and routes with fewest resource conflicts during the breeding season as open to ORV use.

**Definitely Effective**

- No birds, no closure
- Encourage birds to nest along Pea Island and other low impact beaches. Limit development. Encourage birds to nest in a less conflicting area with humans.

**May Be Effective**

- This would open more access for ORVs, but the access corridors should remain as an option.
- Further clarification is required and steering stakeholder should be used to develop this.
- Should be some balance instead of prioritizing breeders over ORV usage
- This can work if more beach can be opened for ORV use.
- ORVs should be banned in breeding areas.
- This would be effective, although must allow for some flexibility if we do get nesting in these areas.
- This could work if "Alternate" ORV routes were to be established to avoid resource, safety, etc. closures.

**Not Effective**

- ORVs should not be allowed in any areas with resource conflicts.

**6.B.8** Prohibit ORVs and pedestrians in all resource protection closures. (*status quo*)

**Definitely Effective**

- Pedestrians could be allowed in some areas closed to protect non-nesting piping plovers, depending on the level of use and disturbance.
- Somewhere in this, trained persons with ties to the beach buggy groups need to be allowed to monitor the birds & closures alongside NPS & USFWS staff. All persons going inside resource closures need to wear NPS or USFW uniforms with reflective vests.
- Inside of symbolic fencing
- Add all pets.

**May Be Effective**

- if the closures don't become uncalled for.
- Vague
- Further clarification is required and steering stakeholder should be used to develop this.

- Reduce the size of resource protection closures to allow more access by ORV to areas of the park that are difficult to access.

**Not Effective**

- need pass thru for both in certain areas
- This alone is not enough to adequately protect the species. Would need to be coupled with additional ORV restrictions during certain times of year.

**6.B.9 Expand the areas where ORV use is permitted during times of extensive resource closures**

**Definitely Effective**

- If there is a resource closure in one area then more beach should be opened in other areas.
- If more access is created by improved ramps and infrastructure then this is the best alternative in times of closures.
- Trails to nowhere, is not the idea. Opening some or all the sound front ,could be workable, if, these accessible waters are fishable.
- The only way to provide adequate access for all types of users is to allow the NPS to respond to the changing environment (including the scope of resource closures) by adjusting boundaries when needed. In no case should lifeguarded beaches be opened to ORV use. I believe that this is consistent with the concept of adaptive management identified as part of the interim plan. As per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate.
- Do this by shrinking the resource closure area.
- When the closed areas expand, the visitation does not currently decline. A minimum open allotment of beach should be established. Example: areas of Pea island can be opened when areas of Cape Hatteras are closed.

**May Be Effective**

- this is a compromise that can be made. Flexibility is the key
- This might be effective if can find adequate areas.

**Not Effective**

- This would do further damage to resources.
- Appears to disregard existing NPS statutes and management policies
- Actually, this makes no sense whatever. Expanded ORV use when the closures are at their most extensive?
- ORV access in the National Seashore should be reduced, not expanded, in order to protect the natural resource
- Resource areas are connected to specific areas and habitat and need to be considered in deciding what kind of access is allowed, ORV vs. passive.

- No requirement for ORV use at the Seashore, thus the park is under no obligation to expand areas for their use at any time for any reason. Besides, after the wildlife uses of the Seashore, there are also visitors who want to walk and enjoy an undisturbed section of the Seashore. They need areas.

**6.B.10** Protect the area 10 meters seaward from the toe of the dune by placing it outside of the ORV corridor, except for those few areas where the beach is so narrow that it would preclude an ORV corridor.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- If the 10 meters is not available, then the area should be closed for safety reasons.

#### **May Be Effective**

- is 10 meters what is needed? for what reasons? would 5 meters be as effective?
- but only if NPS staff can respond rapidly to the changing beach widths
- May be effective if historical and newly created nesting habitat is also protected.

#### **Not Effective**

- Unnecessary restriction on all users
- Constantly changes
- The beach is too dynamic and variable to make this practical or effective.
- Appears inadequate for species protection
- Dune line changes with tides, winds and storms. This would be impractical to manage except when nesting sites are known.
- 10 meters is too much in too many areas. 3 or 4 meters would suffice
- All areas should have ORV corridors
- That is almost 40feet, there are areas where this won't work.
- Due to the constantly changing dune line, this is not feasible. Based upon the fact that the vast majority of ORV users respect the dune line this restriction is not necessary. Park resources would be more effectively utilized by increasing enforcement efforts.
- This would not be effective because the dune line is in constant change and the public would not know where the corridor is from day to day.
- ORVs should be banned from these areas.
- Again this would lead to loss of this area as habitat for those who use it. General public does not know where the toe of a dune is anyway.

### **6.C. Options for Spits and Cape Point/South Beach**

**6.C.1** Designate specific resource areas (i.e., bird habitat areas) and set aside these areas for resource protection. These areas could include: South Point, Cape Point, South Beach, the north end of Ocracoke, and all spits.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- You would need the flexibility to adjust these areas depending on use and habitat condition.
- If required for resource protection and effectively enforced

### **May Be Effective**

- The present bird closure at Cape Point and the south end of Ocracoke are fine as long as the beach along the surf is not closed.
- This could be very effective, but would still need to have some flexibility to reopen some areas and designate new areas if habitat conditions change.

### **Not Effective**

- These are the prime fishing areas, I do not agree with closing access to these areas.
- These are the most attractive fishing areas. Maximum impact
- the entire outer banks is bird habitat area. NPS' problem is to minimize impacts on both birds and users
- This proposal would devastate many local economies and businesses.
- The areas are the most visited areas of the park are the apex of the issue. Large closures will promote the growth of vegetation that destroys the habitat favored by the birds we are trying to protect. Total lock out mgmt is easy to implement but reflects poorly of the NPS. The distance to the spits from parking is excessive and would negate any pedestrian traffic. (comment repeated on 6.C.2, 6.C.4 – 6.C.7)
- These are the most visited areas of the entire Seashore not mention the premier surf fishing location on the East Coast!! Closures of this type would reflect poorly on the NPS as management by padlock. The distance to Cape Point would essentially make it unfishable and take away one of the worlds best surf fishing locations.
- Without these areas open to ORVs the recreation value of the Park will be cut by more than 60%. Nobody thinks that is a good idea, do they? By clearing vegetation on the interior of these areas, it will give the birds more habitat, not less. The goals of this is to make all this stuff work for humans & birds. Try something new.
- Again, this is your most popular area for sport fishing. I would like to see some compromise worked out regarding this.
- 6.C.1 thru 6.C.7 --- no areas should be closed all year round. These areas are some of the most visited areas in CHNS. Setting these areas aside for birds would be detrimental to the publics enjoy of the park.
- You can't designate any particular area due to the ever changing weather and tide conditions that constantly reshape the beach. I realize that Al Gore can predict this but last I checked, he doesn't work for the US Government anymore.
- Never seen birds at the point – only back off the point in dune areas.
- These areas are not only the areas suited for bird enhancement, but are also the main attraction for our visitors and limits or prohibiting should not be considered in this recreational seashore. It would make more sense because this is a highly used recreational seashore that instead of closing more areas in populous areas that interested environmental groups and ORV user groups get together and find least used areas that may now not be suitable for such resting/roosting and foraging habitats used by non-breeding piping plovers and prepare and alter the area to make them prime areas for closures for these birds. That is, it is a known fact that past winter closures have with no ORV use have encouraged growth of vegetation that these birds dislike and caused them to migrate to areas closer to ORV use areas. Close half the section of present closed areas now used and with NPS and volunteering groups prepare the open half to better serve the birds in coming years. These preparations

and allowing ORV use in the area would the habitat for closure of this half in the following year when the other half would be done likewise. Then summer closures would be smaller and winter closures would be patchwork opened to allow every (?) year these groups would further enhance the area for following years and all parties are happier.

- Recent history has clearly shown that year around closures promote vegetation and loss of bird habitat. This concept may work at interior areas, such as the pond at the point, if sand dunes are constructed around them to keep birds and humans seperated. Use herbicides to keep vegetation out. This could be a win win situation. (comment repeated for 6.C.2)

**6.C.2** Maintain east side access to Cape Point to the extent possible. Designate west of Cape Point to Salt Pond Road or Ramp 45 as a year-round or seasonal resource area that would be closed to ORVs.

### **Definitely Effective**

- If you are taking from the ocean edge west side of Cape Point to Salt pond Road and Interdunal Road north boundary.

### **May Be Effective**

- There would need to be an ORV corridor to allow access from Cape Point to Ramp 49.
- Would allow several objectives to be met.
- This is a potential compromise
- Again need to maintain flexibility based on changing habitat conditions.
- It all depends on what the birds and turtles are doing in any given season and on any given day. They are dynamic and management must allow for that. This statement/option does not seem to allow for that. It creates a situation that when the area needs to be closed, people (ORV drivers) get upset.

### **Not Effective**

- Flexibility is needed to determine if these areas need to be closed at all.
- No, the thing to do is clear a lot of the vegetation in this area so the birds will have more areas to use. Then by allowing ORVs access to this areas in late fall & winter can keep the vegetation from getting out of control again.
- Cape Point is a unique natural resource that should be closed to ORVs year-round.
- Shrink all resource closures and let that area be used by tax paying park users. Each year the park service comes up with new closures and new ways to deny access to the beach and each year there are fewer and fewer successful plover nests. Instead of throwing more money and time to what the environmentalists are trying to do (which is to force habitat) lets do less and see what happens
- Need ORV pass thru
- These areas are not only the areas suited for bird enhancement, but are also the main attraction for our visitors and limits or prohibiting should not be considered in this recreational seashore. It would make more sense because this is a highly used recreational seashore that instead of closing more areas in populous areas that interested environmental groups and ORV user groups get together and find least used areas that may now not be suitable for such resting/roosting and foraging habitats used by non-breeding piping plovers and prepare and alter the area to make them prime areas for closures for these birds. That is, it is a known fact that past winter closures have with no ORV use have encouraged growth of vegetation that these birds dislike and caused them

to migrate to areas closer to ORV use areas. Close half the section of present closed areas now used and with NPS and volunteering groups prepare the open half to better serve the birds in coming years. These preparations and allowing ORV use in the area would the habitat for closure of this half in the following year when the other half would be done likewise. Then summer closures would be smaller and winter closures would be patchwork opened to allow every (?) year these groups would further enhance the area for following years and all parties are happier.

- I would think that the food supply would be better and greater on the sound side of Ocracoke spit which is closed year around and maybe by keeping the spits and the point open to recreation the birds would be forced to better habitat.
- Definitely keep the east side open but allow the west side open also, to reduce traffic from only one direction. In recent years it has been a problem with the west side being closed, especially when the campground road is off limits

**6.C.3** Implement a rest and rotation system at certain locations such as Hatteras Spit. Under this system the soundside could be open to ORV use in the summer while the oceanside would be closed for species protection. In the winter this could be reversed and the soundside would be closed to ORV use and the oceanside open, providing the more sheltered soundside shoreline to wintering and migrating birds as a place to forage.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- I think this is a valid compromise that would work

#### **May Be Effective**

- Changing sand conditions and two-way traffic make this impractical.
- Once you close a beach I see it never being opened again to ORV use
- Only good if the dates were a little better defined. Does summer mean the fall or does winter mean the fall?

#### **Not Effective**

- Too large a closure. Large fishing impact
- I would suggest perhaps a checkerboard type of rotation instead of such a drastic rotation. The rotation on a large scale will change the vegetation growth would reduce the habitat of the birds. The areas are the most visited areas of the park are the apex of the issue. Large closures will promote the growth of vegetation that destroys the habitat favored by the birds we are trying to protect. Total lock out mgmt is easy to implement but reflects poorly of the NPS. The distance to the spits from parking is excessive and would negate any pedestrian traffic.
- This would be another one of those overzealous measures that would effectively eliminate Hatteras as a recreational area. As with many of these well-intentioned but ill advised scenarios, the alleged benefactor would more than likely suffer from the advance of vegetation that is unfavorable to same.
- There is no mention of specific dates
- How about plowing down some of the dunes that have formed on brush & storm trash so there would be larger sand flats for the birds to use. Right now there is very little beach between vegetation and the high water line. It gets narrower each year. It is not sea level rise. Getting rid of vegetation reduces predator hiding areas benefiting the birds. Letting vegetation grow unchecked gives us what we have now, no room for either bird or human.
- Hatteras Spit is a unique natural resource that should be closed to ORVs year-round.

- Leave pedestrian access to the sound sides and designate parking areas with trails. All of the sound side is too narrow to allow driving, most areas can't accommodate more than one vehicle with no way to turn vehicle around without driving on vegetation and are impassible at numerous high water conditions
- Does not fully consider the biology of the species. For example, if piping plovers nest at Hatteras Spit, the soundside may provide the best foraging habitat.
- Again you create major portions of the beach or sound side closed that are highly used by recreational visitors and in a highly washover area. Instead why don't you partner with Corp. of Engineer and other entities to provide more and larger dredge spoil islands in the sound that can be created, maintained and closed to public as resting and breeding areas for this wild life. The area of Cape Hatteras Seashore is a shoulder area for both nesting and wintering plovers and be at the edge of their habitat makes it a poor choice for the high cost of trying to increase their populous here. Instead you can take Portsmouth Island who only sees a small percentage of visitors compared to this recreational seashore to do these closures. Portsmouth has little dune structure and many better areas to promote nest and wintering habitats. (comment repeated for 6.C.4 – 6.C.7)
- This is a very poor trade off. It is based on the false premise that ORV users have some right to drive anywhere they want at anytime they want and should have full access to all the park at all times. The shorebirds use both the soundside and Oceanside beaches of the spits for foraging. To have one open and one closed does not allow the birds to eat their preferred meal at their preferred location and time. Again, they are dynamic and their behavior is based on many variables, most of which we do not understand. But they must be protected so their numbers can increase.
- ORV should have temporary routes through the dunes to stop well shy of water's edge on soundside during the winter. This would allow access as a pedestrian after leaving your vehicle. During the summer, ORV routes should be made well shy of closures. This would allow access as pedestrians after leaving your vehicle.

**(No Selection)**

- It seems that the environmentalists forget that birds have wings and are not stupid. They have the ability to fly from one spot to another depending on what they like that day. Do you guys think that you can convince the birds to stay soundside during the winter and Oceanside during the summer? That's ridiculous.

**6.C.4** Close certain spits to all public use during part of the year (April 1 to August 15 or when the last birds fledge, including terns) or year-round.

**May Be Effective**

- summer months
- Allow pedestrian use where appropriate
- Recommend Aug. 31<sup>st</sup> as the end date or when the last bird fledges. Since this only covers certain spits, I'm concerned about what would happen at other areas.

**Not Effective**

- No birds, no closure.
- Year round closures are not acceptable.
- This would harm the local economies.
- April to August is when the beaches are visited, so you might just as well close down the island.
- provide 100' corridors

**6.C.5** Close certain spits to ORVs and pets during part of the year (April 1 to August 15 or when the last birds fledge, including terns).

**Definitely Effective**

- If species enhanced and effectively enforced

**May Be Effective**

- If it is monitored as it was this year.
- May 15- Aug. 15
- Dogs are a greater threat than are ORVs
- Recommend Aug. 31<sup>st</sup> as the end date or when the last bird fledges. Since this only covers certain spits, I'm concerned about what would happen at other areas.

**Not Effective**

- To pets only. Not to ORVs
- provide 100' corridors
- This type of closure will prohibit any pedestrian traffic too. The distance to the spits is too far to walk.

**6.C.6** Designate one or more of the spits or Cape Point to be closed year-round to all access.

**Definitely Effective**

- It would be an effective resource measure but might be too restrictive better to allow pedestrian access or shuttle service.

**May Be Effective**

- Not Cape Point.
- Recommend Aug. 31<sup>st</sup> as the end date or when the last bird fledges. Since this only covers certain spits, I'm concerned about what would happen at other areas.

**Not Effective**

- Again, no area should be closed year round.
- This would destroy the local economies.
- These are the most visited areas of the entire Seashore not mention the premier surf fishing location on the East Coast!! Closures of this type would reflect poorly on the NPS as management by padlock. The distance to Cape Point would essentially make it unfishable and take away one of the worlds best surf fishing locations.
- What would happen if this is done? Vegetation would start growing everywhere, the birds would have less safe areas to nest, rest, forage and so on. On top of that the humans would be very hard to placate.
- Again, this is your most popular area for sport fishing. I would like to see some compromise worked out regarding this.

- This would not accomplish anything but destroying the 7 villages and the economy of Dare County
- One spit is insufficient to prevent stress and provide foraging area for T/E species.

**6.C.7** Designate one or more of the spits or Cape Point to be closed year-round to ORV access. Area would be open to pedestrian access outside of breeding season.

**May Be Effective**

- If this is the Spits.
- Recommend Aug. 31<sup>st</sup> as the end date or when the last bird fledges. Since this only covers certain spits, I'm concerned about what would happen at other areas.

**Not Effective**

- Few pedestrians would walk this far.
- This would destroy the local economies.
- These are the most visited areas of the entire Seashore not mention the premier surf fishing location on the East Coast!! Closures of this type would reflect poorly on the NPS as management by padlock. The distance to Cape Point would essentially make it unfishable and take away one of the worlds best surf fishing locations.
- Discriminating against fishermen
- So the handicapped would be kept out. Or is the NPS going to provide somebody to push the wheelchairs out and back.
- Again, this is your most popular area for sport fishing. I would like to see some compromise worked out regarding this.
- No year round closures of any areas. Because of the distance from the parking lots to the split, visitors would be unable to use this area. Basically than this area would be closed to everyone

**6.D. Management Tools Related to Sea Turtles**

**6.D.1** Encourage concessioners to install turtle friendly lighting (*status quo*)

**Definitely Effective**

- If could be adopted widely
- HI should legislate for "dark skies" lighting implementation Island-wide.
- There needs to be more effort here by Dare Co and NC. This is out of NPS control.
- There must be an economic benefit for any business to actually comply. There is an uncontrollable price for voluntary action.

**May Be Effective**

- This has been done and at a great cost.
- This should be required for concessioners.

- Yes this could be done in the villages. The NPS has no known light that impact the beach. False turtle crawls at CH are under the acceptable ration of 1:1.
- Don't know what "concessioners" are being discussed here...
- Lighting should be unobtrusive and battery-powered.
- So-called "turtle-friendly" lighting works with loggerhead turtles only. As leatherback and green turtles also nest on the beaches of Cape Hatteras, no artificial lighting should illuminate the beach during nesting and hatching seasons (May through November)
- The cottages that line the villages have much more lighting than any business, NPS structure, or pier. If friendly lighting was to be installed it would have to be done to every cottage along the seashore.

#### **Not Effective**

- no study has been done on the Banks to determine what this could be
- Cape Hatteras historical False Crawl ratio is under the acceptable ratio of 1:1 and lower than Cape Lookout where there are no ocean front piers and they do not have seven ocean front villages. The reason that sea turtles make false crawls is not known but is thought to be a natural activity. Without a law or funding from grants, efforts to get turtle friendly lighting by concessioners and ocean front residential houses and businesses will have very limited success. The term "concessioners" should have been in the glossary as not many people realize that you are talking about piers.
- Require them to! They are concessions operating under a permit from, or contract with, the NPS. The piers should have turtle friendly lighting.

#### **6.D.2 Establish turtle-friendly lighting standards for all Seashore (NPS) structures (*status quo*)**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- HI should legislate for "dark skies" lighting implementation Island-wide.
- This should also apply to USFW.

#### **May Be Effective**

- This has been done and at a great cost
- Only if "turtle friendly lighting standards" means that no artificial light reaches the beach during the nesting and hatching seasons (May through November). See above comments.
- Weather must be watched to protect nests. Nest removal must be done to protect eggs.
- Adopting Turtle nest may be effective if they are relocated to safe areas above the forces of the ocean where observation and management would be cost effective and ensure successful hatches.

#### **Not Effective**

- The NPS has no known light that impact the beach.
- I haven't seen any lighting within sight of the shoreline
- Turtle nests should be identified and removed. They should be removed to more remote areas such as Pea Island. The hatch rate would be much more successful. Many of the areas where turtles nest now are subject to storm

erosion. Removing and placing in less volatile areas would allow them to hatch. Many eggs have been lost due to storm erosion, more so than to human interference.

**6.D.3** Establish an approximately 30 feet by 30 feet buffer around sea turtle nests. Approximately 50 to 55 days into incubation, expand closure to the surfline (*status quo*).

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Closure to the surfline should be implemented during the last 15 days
- can move nests to back side of dunes to protect from hurricanes high tides from nor-easters

#### **May Be Effective**

- I think they should be monitored and when the process is complete lift the closure.
- A mistake was made 2yrs ago at ramp 44. There were 2 turtle nests fenced off and 2 different methods of beach grading was done. Those 2 areas is now where the beach is narrow. The grading changed the slope of the beach from what mother nature made, the result now is beach erosion.
- the nests need moved to safer locations, not from ORVs' but the sea itself
- If expanded closure (to surfline) is opened during the day, all tire ruts must be smoothed prior to dusk when the closure is extended again to surfline. This will help hatchlings avoid being “stuck in a rut” during their movement from nest to ocean.
- 3 The expansion of closures at 50 to 55 days will only be effective if the nest had been laid in an area not subject to the forces of the ocean. Historically, CAHA has lost 46% of nests and not relocating nests is the real problem here not the size of turtle closures. It does no good to expand closures when nests have been repeatedly inundated.

#### **Not Effective**

- relocate eggs
- Move nest to safe area so storms don't damage nests
- ORV access should be banned in sea turtle nesting areas year-round.
- move the turtle nests to areas where they have the chance to hatch or incubate.
- Personal experience is there is great respect for turtle nests under existing conditions
- Open surfline (hard sand) during day. 55 days into incubation, prohibit night driving, since this is normal hatching period.
- I am enclosing an article on this subject. Costa Rica hatches almost all the eggs that are laid by relocation of nests. NPS has taken a protocol that refuses to look at this option-why, I don't know. One reason given is temp variation effects sex of animals. I would much rather see 100 females hatch and go sea than die in cold, wet sand. Over the past 10 years hatch records on NPS beaches are horrible and if it were a profit based operation would have ceased years ago. From 2000/2006 over 45% of nests were lost. Predation can come from Ghost Crabs and raccoons, but our beaches are narrow and most nests are flooded over in storms with cold water which kills eggs and can erode nests. Relocate eggs.
- 

**6.D.4** Restrict or prohibit night driving during turtle nesting season dusk to dawn.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Nighttime driving restrictions should run from May through November, to encompass nesting and hatching seasons. Human activity on the beach at night can deter females from nesting, and accidentally injure hatchlings that emerge at night. Also, night driving likely effaces the tracks of nesting turtles, making it difficult for NPS staff to find and mark freshly laid nests during morning patrols.

### **May Be Effective**

- Need definite times.
- If the nests are marked well it should not be problem.
- Probably a very good idea, though restricting and prohibiting are two very different things. Both would be difficult to sell and administer.
- Depends on impact to other users
- The fences used to protect these areas along with proper notification would prohibit this option
- This compromise is possible but only in certain areas . not all and not Cape point
- Restrict, not prohibit, for a trial period
- do not prohibit--restrict to vehicles with red lenses over lights

### **Not Effective**

- Only where turtles nest.
- Well marked closures around turtle nest should be enough for driver to avoid turtle nests at night.
- Educate users of night time actions of turtles.
- Route traffic around nests.
- Establish closures where and when the turtles are currently observed .... NOT in an area used last season. Do not place a closure until the turtles are observed.
- not necessary as long as areas are marked for avoidance.
- Marking the nest is the best defense. False turtle crawls at CH are under the acceptable ration of 1:1.
- not without similar action taken against oceanfront homeowners and their outdoor lighting
- Educate people to avoid any nesting turtles and maintain at least a 100 foot distance. Fine violators.
- most people run with enough light to see turtles
- Show me one study that says turtles are being harmed by this. On almost all the stretches of beach headlights move parallel to the surf line.
- Provide reflective markers and tape around turtle nesting areas.
- If you have nests moved to good hatching areas you should know when the eggs will hatch. Have volunteers ready to move turtles or help so they make it to the water. Topsoil beach.

- False turtle crawls are under the acceptable ratio of 1/1
- False crawls are not a problem here at CAHA as this question suggests. If nests are relocated to “safe” areas the hatchlings would not be disoriented by village, pier or the occasional ORV lights. The volunteer program suggested in 6.D.7 could also shelter hatchlings by placing garden edging in a keyhole fashion at nest sites as has been done by Pea Island for many years in their very successful program. Night driving does not seem to be a problem as there were 24 false crawls in the bird closure at the hook in 2007 where there were no ORVs
- This serves no purpose, especially given the fact that NPS does absolutely nothing to prevent nests from overwash, even if the nests are laid on a very narrow section of beach! NPS won’t take the much needed measures to protect the actual nests/eggs that are identified, yet entertains the notion of banning nighttime driving that MIGHT or MIGHT NOT cause a false crawl? PLEASE!
- Key areas like point and inlet should be lighted to prevent turtle nesting from blocking access.

**6.D.5** Restrict or prohibit night driving during turtle nesting season throughout the Seashore between 8:00 pm and 5:00 am from June 1 to August 31.

**May Be Effective**

- Again, restricting and prohibiting are two very different things, both of which would be labor intensive options, to say nothing about difficult to sell.
- The fences used to protect these areas along with proper notification would prohibit this option

**Not Effective**

- Only where turtles nest.
- Night time usage should not be prohibited.
- Establish closures where and when the turtles are currently observed .... NOT in an area used last season. Do not place a closure until the turtles are observed.
- not necessary as long as areas are marked for avoidance.
- Educate people to avoid any nesting turtles and maintain at least a 100 foot distance. Fine violators.
- Marking the nest is the best defense. False turtle crawls at CH are under the acceptable ration of 1:1.
- The best fishing is at that same time, These fish feed at night. Does the NPS have a way to train the fish to feed more during the day?
- Provide reflective markers and tape around turtle nesting areas.
- Leatherback turtles nest in April
- Nesting can occur in May and also in September, plus nests laid in July and August will produce hatchlings in September–November. Not managing driving during the beginning and end of the nesting/hatching season puts females and hatchlings at risk
- With ORV corridors this would not be necessary as all drivers would be pedestrians once leaving the vehicle parked within the corridor.

**6.D.6** Issue night fishing permits to allow nighttime ORV use for fishing access under certain circumstances.

**May Be Effective**

- Another effort to remove fishermen from the beach
- Some areas should be off-limits to ORVs at night.
- See comments above. Any nighttime driving can negatively impact nesting females and/or hatchlings. Night fishing permits should specify that no driving should occur at night (i.e. fishers must reach fishing area by dusk and remain until dawn).
- Requiring ORV permits is enough. **Night surf fishing should be allowed without requiring a permit.** However, if issuing a permit is the only way that we will be allowed to night surf fish so be it.

#### **Not Effective**

- Not related to turtles use.
- The beaches should be open 24/7 to the public.
- either a permit for all or no permits.
- Night time access should not be prohibited.
- Labor intensive
- no special permits needed
- restrictive. some don't decide to go until after NPS offices are closed. what "circumstances?"
- My N.C. fishing licenses does not have such limitations on fishing.
- Marking the nest is the best defense. False turtle crawls at CH are under the acceptable ration of 1:1.
- All the permits (if issued) should be for the whole Park 24/7.
- Large number of night fishermen purchase revenue producing fishing license to enjoy that recreational element of the park. Permits would not be effective to success of survival as natural predators are the major detriment to turtles. Consider caging nests for protection.

#### **(No Selection)**

- Educate people to avoid any nesting turtles and maintain at least a 100 foot distance. Fine violators. A permit for the sake of requiring a permit is senseless.

**6.D.7** Create an "adopt a turtle nest" volunteer program.

#### **May Be Effective**

- to do what?
- If relocations are allowed away from the forces of the ocean.
- could work if adopters guard against predators 24/7
- most effective would be to relocate nest away from predators and beach traffic
- The turtles that place a nest in a vulnerable spot have to be moved or incubated.

- Adopt a turtle program was used this season. So long as this activity does not detract from resources needed to ensure access and provide LE this could be an effective education tool.
- This may help raise public awareness but is not sufficient in itself.
- A program fashioned after that at Pea Island would work but only if nests are relocated to “safe” areas. The cost savings of attending ten “safe” area sites (erecting stakes, stringing stakes, erecting and replacing silt fencing, travel and time) rather than one hundred different nest sites would be substantial. Furthermore it would require far too many volunteers to watch each nest separately for the entire hatch window for conceivably twenty or more days
- This program would only be effective if volunteers were to help dig up the nest to transplant in a more suitable area for hatching. When hatching begins volunteers could deter the gulls.

**6.D.8** Work with Dare County to develop turtle friendly lighting standards in the villages and create incentives for voluntary compliance. Support program with educational component.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Voluntary compliance is key.
- HI should legislate for "dark skies" lighting implementation Island-wide.
- Again, get Dare Co. to spend some of that 10% rental tax.
- This is a very good idea. If Dare County mandated turtle friendly lighting standards, why would compliance be voluntary, it should become mandatory?

#### **May Be Effective**

- Sounds like much work for limited number of turtles in this area.
- While I am not certain that there is any documented evidence that lighting at CHNSRA is adversely impacting turtles , voluntary incentives for more friendly lighting could be effective, so long as this activity does not detract from resources needed to ensure access and provide LE this could be an effective education tool.
- This requirement should be for beach front properties only. Especially near the ferry docks at Hatteras.
- Can be effective only if “turtle friendly” is understood to mean that no artificial light should reach the beach at night during the nesting and hatching seasons. Dune and/or vegetation management may help to block land-side lighting from reaching the beach.

#### **Not Effective**

- Lights in the villages should not affect the turtles
- While it may not be a popular idea, the fact is that the primary cause for the destruction of turtle eggs is predation. The beaches could be closed to all vehicle and pedestrian traffic, and still the ghost crabs will continue to destroy the eggs at the same rate. More energy should be focused on tactics that work, not tactics that feel good. ‘Caging’ the nests have worked in other areas.
- Seriously, when has a turtle strolled into one of the villages and been offended by the lighting? Am I missing something here? Don’t they just come up on the beach, lay their eggs, then roll out?
- These cottages have no year long residence, they rent there to the public. They are not going to reight homes to comply.

## **6.E. Regulate Pet Access**

**6.E.1** Pets must be crated, caged, restrained on a leash or otherwise physically confined at all times in all areas of the Seashore. (*status quo*)

### **Definitely Effective**

- Only if adequately policed.
- Pet waste also needs to be picked up by owners. Fines need to be for first offenders.
- Control of pets is desirable from a safety standpoint as well as a species protection standpoint.

### **May Be Effective**

- Effective enforcement key and excluded from closed areas.
- Away from closure areas and high passive use areas dogs could be under the voice command of the owner.
- A low impact area for dog training should exist
- I have a small dog and we park close to the ocean we keep our dog leashed except when playing frisbee at the ocean's edge, we only play when other people or dogs are not in area
- This is only as good as the enforcement and can be very difficult to enforce over such a large area. It might be necessary to restrict pets in areas with bird use and inadequate enforcement.

### **Not Effective**

- At a minimum, if you enforce this, you should do it on some basis consistently applied. I just got back from 10 days in the Seashore and my dogs ran on the beach off leash every morning, at least twice in plain sight of a park ranger in his/her truck.

**6.E.2** Allow pets on a leash in all locations except within resource protection closures. (*status quo*)

### **Definitely Effective**

- Control of pets is desirable from a safety standpoint as well as a species protection standpoint.
- Raccoons, hawks, foxes more of a danger than dogs near the water. Dogs should be leashed – greater chance of harm to humans than birds esp if there are only 3 piping plovers at the point.
- The public must be made aware of the length of leashes required in the law

### **May Be Effective**

- Same as above. Also, even pets on a leash can be a significant source of disturbance.
- Once breeding and germination productivity are sustained.

**6.E.3** Prohibit pets at spits and Cape Point during breeding season.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Better yet, prohibit all pets from all beaches

### **Not Effective**

- 6.e.1
- If they are restrained, it's not a problem.
- Pets are the least of concern. Predators are pedestrians are more to the issue of disturbance. (comment repeated on 6.E.4 and 6.E.5)
- Pets should be banned at these locations year-round.
- I'd just as soon be rid of the dogs at Cape Point. But this sounds like an enforcement nightmare

**6.E.4** Provide a minimum 300 foot additional buffer distance for bird resource closures for locations where pets are permitted.

### **May Be Effective**

- Pets should be kept clear of nesting areas.

### **Not Effective**

- I think with the leash laws, and the other buffers that's more than enough precaution.
- Provide standard buffer and enforce resource closures.
- As per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate. If any changes are made, they should be to reduce the number and size of resource closures. Issues regarding pers can be addressed via enforcement.
- So as a non pet owner that restricts my access.
- This might help if the initial buffers are large enough. However, there is still the issue of enforcement and concerns when unfledged chicks in area.
- Need a 1/4 mile buffer for T/E to allow for foraging and predator avoidance.
- They are not allowed to run free, why increase restrictions?
- Do not allow 600' diameter closures especially if pets are leashed
- I could agree with this if the number was changed to 50

**6.E.5** Prohibit pets everywhere but in developed areas (lighthouses, historic districts, etc.).

### **Definitely Effective**

- not safe or healthy for people due to pets relieving themselves on beach
- Yes. This would also eliminate the problem of pet fescues on the beach.

### **May Be Effective**

- As long as they are on leashes they shouldn't be prohibited everywhere.
- So I could have them in my vehicle? Look at your rules for pets in other NPS locations, such as Rocky Mountain National Park or Mesa Verde.

## Not Effective

- Not necessary see 6.E.1 and 6.e .2
- People have the right to take their pets with them to the beach as long as they are responsible and follow the rules.
- As per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate. If any changes are made, they should be to reduce the number and size of resource closures. Issues regarding pers can be addressed via enforcement.
- This would encourage violations. Enforce the regulations on distance from resource areas and leashes
- There should be pet friendly designated areas throughout the Park.
- Obviously this suggestion gives little regard to our economy. Traveling with pets is nationwide, with books and websites geared specifically to traveling with your pet. There is a huge market for this! Secondly, dogs as well as cats will still end up on the beaches, this is a populated island remember! Pets do get out and they do wander, even if they have a responsible owner! Thirdly MANY residents enjoy walking on the beach with their dogs!

## 6.F. Implement Additional Research Programs

**6.F.1** Develop a local program with USFWS to band and track piping plovers to improve identification of breeding pairs and obtain a long-term analysis on the effect of ORVs and other factors on piping plover.

### Definitely Effective

- The more information the better, keeps from making unpopular decisions with out back up data.
- Data to monitored by independent research committee. To protect **falsifying** of data.
- Up to date research is needed, but the concept of banding these birds would appear to be doing more harm than good. If they can be banded, they should be relocated.

### May Be Effective

- A diverse stakeholder advisory panel should provide governance, oversight and recommendations with the results of these studies and findings. (comment repeated for 6.F.2 and 6.F.3)
- I don't think this should be something the NPS should be responsible for this.
- may be effective if banding of the hatchlings isn't attempted again. BIG waste of resources and may have contributed to chicks demise
- ORVs have NOT had anything to do with the poor nesting results of plovers. Notes from 2006 said that unfledged chick deaths were on nights when there where thunder storms. The study should be to see if ORVs cause thunder storms, or whether Ghost Crabs can be trained not to eat plover chicks.
- And get some of the scientists who've already done such studies to take the lead
- Although not sufficient by itself, well-designed, peer reviewed studies could be very effective in helping to direct management in the future.
- If done with an "independent" analysis. By "independent" use a source that is more balanced than the one that did the economic impact study.

- Sample size possibly too small and meaningless.

#### **Not Effective**

- The effects of ORV's on plovers long term is well established, look at the recovery at CACO
- Banding carries risks that may outweigh the benefits.
- this may be too stressful for the few birds that use in the CAHA
- ORV/plover conflicts have been studied to death and it has been showed repeatedly that plovers and ORV's can co-exist with proper management.
- Birds will survive if they are meant to be here they will if not it is called survival of the fittest.
- Piping Plovers historically do not do well in this area. Do not encourage them to nest here.
- The interim plan identifies human disturbance as one of the factors limiting breeding and resting opportunities for birds. I fail to see how additional disturbance (beyond that included in the interim plan) can enhance breeding and resting opportunities.
- Cage the nests like in Back Bay

**6.F.2** Conduct local research to determine causes of piping plover chick mortality.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- NPS rangers are a major predator.
- Follow USF&W recovery plan like everyone else
- Don't you think it's the cats, coons and big gulls that are killing the chicks?
- Predation has caused the deaths that weather didn't Both of these are caused by MOTHER NATURE. She is very hard to please.

#### **May Be Effective**

- I think this would prove out the fact that the plover is victim to weather and predators not ORV access.
- Maybe you'll finally accept that CHNSRA is not good place for plovers to breed. You already have enough evidence to reach this conclusion but if you want to spend more money on research then have at it. You already know what the causes of chick mortality are but don't seem to want to accept it.
- Although not sufficient by itself, well-designed, peer reviewed studies could be very effective in helping to direct management in the future.
- I believe the research is already available. Years with no storms chicks successfully fledge. Years with storms the chicks do not survive.

#### **Not Effective**

- As per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate. The plan includes provisions for determining the causes of breeding failures
- Look at the feral cats

- With the size of closures in 2007 a logical cause for mortality would seem to be our weather and all potential predators. To solve mortality someone would have to figure out how to have far less volatile weather (which seems to be a major cause) and all natural predators would have to be eliminated which would include, but not limited to cats, fox, mink, herring gulls, great black back gulls, bald eagles, all hawks and ghost crabs. One could not even see plovers in 2007 without a scope as they were so far away. How far can a plover see?
- I think you can study birds on the fringe of their habitat all you want and discover that the reason they are not increasing in population is due to the fact that this area is the northern fringe of their normal habitat.

**6.F.3** Conduct local research to determine the impact of ORVs on the beach ecosystem as a whole (e.g., food sources).

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Constant changing conditions are not determined by ORV.

#### **May Be Effective**

- again look to Massachusetts, these studies have been done and this information exists already
- This should be done with caution and by a research group that has not been influenced by outside groups.
- Great idea, but probably pie in the sky. Would raise expectations to impossible levels, I'm afraid. But efforts to do it should continue to be made.
- Along with a study of commercial fishing's impact on same. Conduct a study to determine the economic impacts of recreational fishing and related tourism on HI economy.
- Although not sufficient by itself, well-designed, peer reviewed studies could be very effective in helping to direct management in the future.
- Don't forget the many other factors including hurricanes and nor-easters, pedestrians, feral cats for example
- This could be effective, but must be compared with impact on the environment caused by the natural environment (e.g. storms, high tides, wind blown sand, etc.)
- Researchers should be gov't employees and not financially tied to the endangered status of the species. Conflict of interest standards must apply when choosing researchers.

#### **Not Effective**

- As before, I am against a specific study on one user group. If you're going to do studies. study the whole human impact! This is specifically targeting one user group!!!
- environmental groups will be solicited and will say anything to get ORVs areas shutdown. Even if the effect is negligible!
- recent closures may have contributed to chick failure by removing humans
- This also has been studied repeatedly and it is showed that with proper management vehicles on the beach are beneficial to the formation of dunes. See Kaye study.
- People have been driving on these beaches for 75 years or more our ecosystem is fine.
- The "interim strategy" has kept ORVs away from unfledged chicks for some time. Not exploring a way to clear the vegetation around the pond and allowing uncontrolled vegetation growth inside the closure assures that there will always be less & less opportunities for additional feeding areas.

- Research conducted in 2003 by Perry led to the conclusion that any damage done by ORVs is erased by one storm event. Based upon these results and other research identified by Ted Hamilton, another research project is a waste of scarce resources.
- Not effective as ORV's have not been allowed to drive where plovers and oyster catchers have nested or feed at spits and the point in years as these areas have been closed even when birds are not here. As a result of these policies vegetation has overtaken the habitat. This is also true for non ground feeders such as terns and skimmers who nest at spits and the point.

**6.F.4** Experiment with a year-round closure in one prime bird area to let natural processes take place.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- At least and continue for 3-5 years.

#### **May Be Effective**

- No criteria to measure effectiveness
- don't you have year-round closed areas already?
- To be conducted in an area away from the fishing areas.
- Fine idea, but its effectiveness would depend on its size and the degree to which the park can police it and collect real-time data on the area. Also depends on where and how big the area is.
- If this is to be done, do it at Pea Island
- And compare it to a year-round "open" area.
- only if this includes uninhibited predation, eg. no trapping or molestation of natural predators
- How about the research first to have something to compare.
- Although not sufficient by itself, well-designed, peer reviewed studies could be very effective in helping to direct management in the future.

#### **Not Effective**

- We already have an area with a permanent year round ORV closure its called Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge.
- Those closures will be permanent.
- Not necessary. Year round closures tend to change the habitat. Partial closures for sightings of nests is all that is needed.
- Could allow vegetation to grow causing loss of breeding area
- Areas of Pea Island could already provide this!
- We don't have enough birds to justify this
- That is a lazy way to prove; doing nothing is a bad idea. There is plenty of evidence showing the uncontrolled growth of weeds, grasses, and brush inside of the closures now. There is proof that the beach nesting birds don't go near this vegetation.

- As per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate. If any changes are made, they should be to reduce the number and size of resource closures.

**6.F.5** Work with USFWS, other national seashores, and state wildlife agencies to develop shorebird websites so agencies and the public can track migration up and down the coast of tagged shorebirds.

**Definitely Effective**

- Good idea since what I have seen of USFWS has not proven to me to be a reliable agency when it comes to managing of wildlife resources.

**May Be Effective**

- These programs already exist for shorebirds (WHSRN).
- Good idea, but I suspect it will be costly to keep the sites up to date. How would the data be used as part of the ORV management system?
- May be useful if data in timely
- Conduct a study to determine the economic impacts of recreational fishing
- This may help with various banding projects and to raise public awareness, but not sufficient by itself.

**Not Effective**

- USFWS already spends far too much time and tax payer money on this issue.
- Would effect small amount of people
- This is an incredible waste of scarce resources, the benefit of which is questionable at best.
- Stop wasting money. If birdwatchers want it they can pay for it

**6.G. Other Tools Related to Species Protection**

**6.G.1** Continue existing predator management activities including trapping predators for removal and surveying around nests for signs of predators and erecting predator exclosures around nests with eggs (*status quo*)

**Definitely Effective**

- I don't like it when Foxes are killed, but it has to be done. Ghost crabs seem to be the chief culprit in the predation of unfledged chicks. They also scavenge the thunder-storm wet/frightened chicks. What can be done about crabs?
- As per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate.
- Predators are responsible for a high per-centage of bird damage. A more aggressive program of pest control needs to be enacted. Feral cats need to be controlled not only in the CHNS but also in the villages.
- It is effective as far as making bird habitat more productive, but what of the natural predators on the island?

**May Be Effective**

- What type and what extent would these predator exclosures be? What detrimental impact could these have on the shorebirds?

- Enclosures are good. Trapping is questionable since you are now disturbing natural forces. Probably OK.
- Who is protecting the other animals. Everyone is worried about the killing of the dolphins in nets – how about the tuna?? Same here.
- Has not worked very well so far. Maybe we should stop trying to attract these birds here in the first place and thus encourage them to go to safer locations. How do you get rid of ghost crabs which are probably the greatest land predator of sea turtle eggs and hatchlings.

#### **Not Effective**

- Why are some animals protected and some are not? Isn't it natural processes for Foxes and raccoons to eat bird chicks?
- Indigenous predator species on OBX should be given the same protection as the birds. These species have coexisted for many years before man began to interfere. Removing predators creates an artificial and unnatural environment for the birds. For feral species.... they should be removed.
- This is the area where efforts need to be stepped up because this is the real problem for the endangered birds.
- Aren't predators part of the natural process.
- You want a natural ecosystem yet you also want to trap and remove predators. This is not natural.
- Eliminate feral cats and strictly control raccoon food sources

#### **6.G.2 Prohibit all fireworks in the Seashore at all times. (*status quo*)**

##### **Definitely Effective**

- As per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate.
- This needs to be enforced with fines. Fire works are now illegal on all of Hatters and Ocracoke Islands

##### **May Be Effective**

- Fireworks will be used regardless of the rule.

##### **Not Effective**

- I would like to see fireworks allowed on the beach because it offers a safer alternative to the local communities.
- Have fireworks been a problem? Mandate the cleanup but not aware of problems.
- Presently Dare County has a law banning any sell, possession or discharge of fireworks on Hatteras Island making this rule unneeded. The status quo is effective for the rest of the seashore

#### **6.G.3 Prohibit kite flying, kite boards, and ball and Frisbee tossing within or above all bird closures. (*status quo*)**

##### **Definitely Effective**

- Add next to the enclosures
- As per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate. If any changes are made, they should be to reduce the number and size of resource closures.

### **May Be Effective**

- Follow USF&W recovery plan like everyone else
- Buffer zones should apply
- Need more specific language (e.g. acceptable distance from nesting sites, language on kite board retrieval, other extreme sports).
- You better add model plane flying , throwing footballs, kicking soccer balls etc.
- These can be harmful even if NEAR a closure, so this option should be expanded.
- Closures extend only to the waterline. Anything/anyone IN the ocean is NOT within the closure. Kite flying should not interfere with birds at the higher altitudes, but care should be taken when pulling the kite in to avoid disturbing birds in closures.

### **6.G.4 Identify opportunities for habitat restoration or enhancement.**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Habitat development does work. New piping plover habitat was created and successfully supports nest birds in Island Beach State Park, Seaside Park, NJ.
- This is what I've been saying about the vegetation eradication inside the enclosures, this would be an enhancement.
- Taking measures to mitigate for the impact of hard structures via management of ponds and vegetation is consistent with the Piping Plover recovery plan. Such activities will benefit other bird populations, as well as allow for continued recreational access. A good example came as a result of the limited amount of storm activity witnessed during the past two years. As a result, the water behind the alternate route to the point dissipated exposing mud flats. These mud flats provided a rich food source for piping plovers and a variety of other birds. Furthermore, since the birds did much of their foraging on these mud flats, it was not necessary to restrict access to the popular areas around the point. As another example, the USFWS actively manages ponds and wetlands on Pea Island so as to provide optimal habitat.
- In the past NPS raked vegetation out of areas to form habitat and ORV traffic helped control vegetation. Areas closed to ORVs should definitely have some sort of vegetation control. Otherwise the habitat will continue to move toward the prime recreation areas as it is now doing.
- Beach and sound side is much more grown up with vegetation causing loss of habitat for many shorebirds

#### **May Be Effective**

- in some areas this may be effective. in others it may be a waste of money
- Restore Pea Island to its natural state – circa 1900.
- A labor intensive activity, both at the inventory level and later when restoration or enhancement is accomplished.
- As long as large closures are not used. Checkerboard closures rotated might be better
- open some areas to orv's may enhance habitat anyway
- Can be very effective, but should not replace protection of traditional nesting sites.

- Pea Island is maybe an answer but you are still trying to attract these birds to an inhospitable environment. Is inviting birds to their death the answer? NPS policies have destroyed habitat at the interiors of spits and Cape Point by allowing grass to take over. Allow ORV use in non breeding season like in the past and the habitat problem is solved.
- The finding of new habitat that has developed through natural means, not the “production” of new habitat to intentionally create more closures

### **Not Effective**

- Wouldn't a variety of weather conditions continuously change the habitat

**6.G.5** Conduct controlled habitat restoration research using spoil from dredging to cover a vegetated area and create new habitat if funding and the opportunity were available, but not as a scheduled action.

### **Definitely Effective**

- I would love to see additional small islands formed to birds could be completely isolated from humans. Dredge up areas, create islands and plant appropriate cover.
- It can be done with a bulldozer without having to add any sand. Just dig up the vegetation and make one big pile out of it. The idea is to clear the vegetation. Then in the fall & winter allow ORV access to drive in this area. This will help to keep the vegetation down.
- Do it in the Sound
- This report from NC Wildlife indicts bird habitat formed by making islands out of dredge spoil is viable. This has been talked about in the past and seems to be an area that needs to be pushed in the future as an alternate to beach closings. Even though these areas may be outside the Seashore the islands around the inlet areas are close enough that they should be considered in the overall big picture of whether populations are decreasing. <http://www.ncwildlife.org/index.htm> The link won't go directly to the report. To get to the report click on "more news" in the blue NEWS bar and then click the last item under FEBRUARY 2008 (Survey Finds Some Nesting Waterbird Populations Continue to Decline)

### **May Be Effective**

- Not sure how destroying one habitat to make another with dredge spoil has a net benefit.
- Should be attempted on experimental basis outside Seashore
- Let the money come from other sources
- Spoil mgmt might work but should not be the genesis for beach closures. Only use if there is not restrictions or closures that might be prolonged for spoil mgmt.
- Taking measures to mitigate for the impact of hard structures via management of vegetation is consistent with the Piping Plover recovery plan. In fact, according to the recovery plan tasks 1.242, "a small-scale vegetation removal experiment was conducted at Cape Hatteras National Seashore in 1993. The results were encouraging, with piping plovers and other shorebirds using the treated area for nesting and foraging immediately (J. Nicholls in litt. 1994). This program was expanded during the next two seasons, and in 1995, it encompassed approximately 90 acres at Cape Point and 20 acres at Hatteras Spit (Collier and Lyons in NPS 1995)." Based upon the above assessment of past efforts and the fact that restoration of habitat could reduce conflicts between attempts to provide for shorebirds and recreational uses, this alternative is a win/win. As such, it should be a high priority item and every effort should be made to secure funding for this endeavor.
- Can be very effective, but should not replace protection of traditional nesting sites.

- Why not as a scheduled action, this should be the obvious approach. Again get money from environmental groups. The western edge of Ocracoke spit would seem to be an excellent place to start creating nesting habitat as this area is close to feeding area for terns and ground feeders like plovers. Ocracoke is a small island with no raccoons and because of it's size would be easier to reduce other predators.
- This should be a scheduled activity until the habitat is restored to pre 1986 where possible.

### **Not Effective**

- Habitat restoration and renewal is a function of the tides, storms, wind, rain and other natural events..... not by man
- May benefit some species but protection of existing habitat is more important. There are no guarantees that artificially created habitat will be utilized.
- Too much overwash from hurricanes. Waste of money.
- create new sound side habitat from the spoil, specifically new islands that will support birds and additional wildlife
- Protection of the resources should not be based on funding. Use of dredge spoils to restore habitat in areas other than those used by pedestrians and ORV users (mainly on south side of Oregon inlet and in the sound) should be budgeted for annually as a recurring scheduled expense.

**6.G.6** Increase core resource management staffing on a year-round basis, instead of relying so heavily on seasonal employees.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Long-term staff would develop the local knowledge needed to effectively manage sensitive species.
- Necessary increase, but not to exclusion of research collaborators and seasonals. Overall increase in capability needed
- With people that know what they are doing with college degrees not hands on high school graduates or ged graduates.

### **May Be Effective**

- This is something the superintendent has authority to do by shifting FTEs.
- Most activity is based on seasonal use.
- Staffing should be increased to support.
- Get good people in the management that are creative. Allow some of the ORV groups to augment the seasonal employees.
- As long as when plovers, oystercatchers, skimmers, and other protected with closure seabirds are closely monitored, so as to close a closure when no longer needed.

### **Not Effective**

- Resource management is now adequately staffed for a fringe area where these birds nest and winter. Cost and use could be better used in areas where it is not a fringe area and not as populated with recreational users to benefit the wildlife such as Portsmouth Island.

#### **6.G.7** Turn over management of bird habitat areas to USFWS under an interagency agreement.

##### **May Be Effective**

- Is there a precedent for this?
- They have no vested interest in the NPS and another bureaucracy is not needed.
- I am very leery of the bias of USFWS protected resources personnel.

##### **Not Effective**

- The NPS should manage the park for the best balance between public access and resource protection. The USFWS would not consider public access as a concern for policy.
- With biologists in control ORV's would never see the beach again!
- USFWS is already holding up the replacement of the Bonner Bridge on bird issues, their data is flawed.
- No, no no. This is the worst suggestion so far - if you must cede jurisdiction, it needs to be other than the USFWS, who would be overzealous in enforcing the ORV plan.
- This is a NPS responsibility.
- This is park land - should be under park management.
- USFWS has different goals than those stated in Cape Hatteras national recreational seashore charter
- Not necessary. Need continuity and local prudence only. Division of the oversight function will only result in mismanagement and confusion to the public.
- Look at what has been done on Pea Island, nothing, in recent memory. They do not care about humans, or birds for that matter.
- Park management is in the best position to know the conditions and recreational requirements at CHNSRA. As per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate. This being the case, management should remain in the hands of the park service.
- No the USFWS does not have to answer to the public. If they manage bird habitat on CHNS, they will be able to close any beach at any time. A prime example of their power is how they are holding up the replacement of the Bonner Bridge

##### **Additional comments regarding species protection options:**

- When the Park was established it was set aside for public recreation while Pea Island was set up for wildlife protection. If there are closures for resource protection in the recreational areas the beaches should be made available for ORV use. Wildlife Refuge or steps should be taken to protect resources in the Park with minimal restrictions on public access.
- As much as I'm an avid fisherman, surfer, and waterman I believe we need to protect the unique migratory populations as well as the indigenous species on the outer banks first. I think we can have a balance and accomplish a give and take relationship with our resources. Not one group of human organizations that adore the outer banks will be completely appeased with the outcomes, but that doesn't matter. What matters is the preservation of the resource and ability to enjoy all it has to offer, not just the birds, fish, shipwrecks it's the whole thing. I have spent many days on the beach for many reasons, and will say that as a whole the true surfer and fisherman do more good to help clean,

educate others, and take care of the outer banks. They also will have a better understanding as to how each of the objectives above can positively affect the islands.

- What I saw above is an open attempt to eliminate ORV access and waste federal monies needed elsewhere.
- The US Fish & Wildlife Agency stated in it's recovery plan that the piping plover population was estimated to reach full recovery by 2010. (<http://www.fws.gov/northeast/pipingplover/recplan/summary.html>). This is occurring under present management activities. Therefore, it seems that the current practices are effective. If this is so, we do not need to take drastic measures to prevent the public from using a very unique national park. The piping plover has been touted as the most sensitive of the various species. We want to protect the wildlife - turtles, fish, birds and all. However, if the environment is healthy now, why change it. In addition, closing spits and Cape Point seems to be an exercise in futility. These areas are swept clean on a regular and frequent basis just due to natural actions of wind and water. Closing them seems to have nothing to do with resource protection.
- I am in favor of protecting certain endangered species with a common sense approach. Closing certain areas of the beach sounds like a good idea to some. But in the time I have spent on the beach I have noticed far more birds outside of the closed areas especially if they are feeding. This tells me that mother nature has far more common sense than we do because she taught the birds to feed where the food is and not how to read our signs.
- There should be areas where pets can be allowed to roam freely.
- Species/resource protection is mandated by NPS Organic Act, amendments, related statutes, directives and management policies and must be paramount to all management considerations.
- This section has been a particularly difficult and frustrating one for me to work with. I have checked almost all of the "status quo" elements "Not effective," because it seems to me the data available in the pending law suit and the numbers it claims are by definition evidence that whatever is now being done is not enough, not done correctly, or otherwise not effective. I would argue every piece of the status quo merits serious study and analysis to discover what is going wrong, if anything. It is simply not enough to claim poverty and lack of staff.
- It appears that the only species that is not protected is the fishermen.
- Having a degree in Biology I can appreciate all the effect that goes into species protection. However this is not my field of expertise. For me to give my opinion without first seeing any data and talking to people that have the expertise in this field would be wrong. However I chose to leave things as they are until I hear otherwise. I feel the human species is a major player in nature and is a part of nature. The demise of a species though it may be sad has happened in Earth's past and will happen again. This has happened because of our actions or inactions. This also has happened through no fault of ours at all.
- If propagation of endangered species is a real goal, it can be far more effectively achieved by incubating the eggs and nurturing the hatchlings and releasing them into the wild under more favorable conditions.
- Okay. You really have your work cut out for you on this one. There were way too many eyewitness reports and inconsistencies with the "Species Protection Plan". On one hand you're trying to protect 3 little birds and KILLING local wildlife on the other. I guess the bird lovers don't give a hoot about foxes. You're in a National park... you're supposed to protect ALL wildlife.
- The historical data over a 10 year period will prove that the current policies and strategies are not effective. From 2000 to 2006 46.1% of nests were lost and those that hatched only had a 20% hatch rate. Predation is the key and that should be the primary focus. Alternatives such as caging the nests should also be explored. Large scale closures have a negative impact on the habitat for the very birds that are being attracted. Checkerboard closures that are rotated would be better especially in the spit areas.
- I believe that until we learn to control the tides and control the weather. Extra closing will not help. A good many nest and possible nest were destroyed by weather, not ORV or other vacationers.

- I am all for protecting our wildlife as well as beach habitat resources, but in my opinion, the restrictions and closures have severely restricted ORV beach access. ORV use on the Hatteras beaches is part of the Island's historic tradition of surf fishing. I believe a more common sense approach can protect both our wildlife/habitat resources as well as preserving the historic tradition of freely fishing and enjoying the Cape Hatteras shoreline. In particular, I am very opposed to the pre-nesting closures and the size of the migrational set aside areas
- Several years ago there was a story in the VA Pilot. The story was of a turtle nest that appeared in a developed area of Sandbridge. Instead of closing the area and letting nature take its course the nest was moved to the park area farther south. I guess if you have the money to buy a million dollar beach front house you can have special privileges and the rules don't apply. If you have rules for beach closures for habitat they should apply to all areas even in front of the villages. After all the little bit of beach in front of my ORV is my little million dollar house.
- Let nature take its course with all of the animals in question.
- No one is against species protection. Boundaries should probably be set around nesting areas for both turtles and birds. Size of the area is debatable. Certainly the whole beach does not need to be closed to ORVs (exception possibly turtles at night). The main threat to bird or turtle reproduction (Species Protection) is from predators not humans
- Current policies are a failure. From 2000 to 2006 1% of nests were lost which include those that hatched less than 20 of the eggs. Predation is primarily from ghost crabs.
- Species protection is important but not more so than the human beings that live in and visit the CHNSRA
- More research is needed on bird populations, nesting locations, behavior, etc. before enforcing some of the above closures and restrictions
- Historical data over a 10 year period will prove that current policies are a dismal failure. For the period 2000-2006 46.1% of nests were lost which include those that hatched less than 20% of the eggs. Predation is primarily from ghost crabs and only Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge has solved the problem by "caging" the nests. As mentioned earlier, there are many scientific studies, many of which were paid for by NPS that find that with proper management and enforcement ORV operation and shore birds are compatible. Is this NPS monies wasted if these studies are ignored?
- Not wanting to sound insensitive, but most of this "species protection" sounds like feel good stuff with little or no proven value—I'm an avid birder, enjoy the sea creatures and the wildlife here on the Island—But it seems like we're losing sight of what the National Seashore was supposed to be—We(birds, turtles, whatever)can all enjoy it—Lets not make it so difficult.
- Please don't close the beaches because of birds. The birds seem to do just fine. I have been a regular on the beach for more than 20 years and the birds have adapted just fine to the increase of traffic. Please don't let a few people take a very important resource form the people it really belongs to. Ido understand protecting wildlife but people should be protected also.
- Really, most of this is over my head, however I do know that statistics over the past 10 years show that the current policy has been a failure, so that is why I marked most items as not effective. I also know that MOST loss of nest and chicks is from natural predation and the inclement weather. I am very interested in the idea of caging the nests in order to negate natural predation and allow maximum user enjoyment of the park.
- Since the park is not a wildlife refuge, establishing rules for any wildlife protection other than federally-mandated endangered species can not be supported by the general public. Confrontation will always be present. ORV use must be limited when endangered species (piping plovers and sea turtles) have established nest within the park. Buffer areas adjacent to the nesting sites must be strictly enforced. Each site must be roped off and signs erected to restrict all ORV/pedestrian entry until the nesting chicks and turtles have fledged. Endangered seabeach amaranth growth sites must be roped off and signs erected to restrict all ORV/pedestrian entry year-round.

- The National Park Service is funded by American taxpayers for recreation purposes. While I am for wildlife protection to a point, it seems that the wildlife is placed higher than people. We have Pea Island Wildlife Refuge and I feel this is a great thing. Pea Island should be kept free of ORVs and closed to all when necessary. ORV's are being pushed out of too many other areas due to wildlife. We should not encourage breeding in these areas, only encourage breeding at Pea Island. If possible, bird nests should be moved to Pea Island also. Historically, birds don't do well on many of our beaches due to storms and natural predators. Hatteras Island is a large tourist area. Maybe livelihoods depend on tourist. Too many closures as well as banning ORVs could cause many to take their vacation dollars elsewhere. Keep Pea island for the wildlife, keep the rest of the seashore for use by people.
- The "interim plan" is working, a tweak here & there won't hurt. Nothing new has been tried. How about clearing the grasses & brush on the interiors of the spits & the point? The pond at the point is a untapped resource for feeding shore birds. Clear the shore of this area on the south & west sides. Clear the brush between the pond and ramp 45. There is a huge amount of valuable feeding resources in that area. At Hatteras spit the inside area should also be cleared, this will allow the birds to nest/rest farther from the shore line. The same thing can be done at Oregon Inlet, clear the interior of brush & grasses. This will allow birds to feed at the small creeks and puddles that would form. In the fall & winter take down the closure fences, let the ORVs drive in that area. This will help keep regrowth down & create areas for feeding spots to develop. Look what happened to the puddle that developed near the end of the pole road on the sound side after Isabel. Because ORVs where blocked from using that piece of road, a rich stew of bugs and aquatic life grew in that puddle. Birds fed there so much, NC Audubon wanted to preserve the puddle & not let that section of road be used again. This could be recreated many times on the insides of the point & spits. We have to do something. It has been proved over & over, doing nothing, does not work.
- As per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate. With respect to recreational uses, if any changes are made, they should be to reduce the number and size of resource closures. Last season, the closures were so extensive that users could not even see the birds being protected. With respect to habitat management, these types of activities are part of the Piping Plover recovery plan thus are relevant. Furthermore, the benefits to be derived from proactive habitat management will accrue to other bird species and recreational uses. For example, as a result of the limited amount of storm activity witnessed during the past two years. As a result, the water behind the alternate route to the point dissipated exposing mud flats. These mud flats provided a rich food source for piping plovers and a variety of other birds. Furthermore, since the birds did much of their foraging on these mud flats, it was not necessary to restrict access to the popular areas around the point. Had the park service managed this extension of salt pond in previous years, breeding success rates may have been higher and the 2005 and 2006 closures of popular recreational areas at the point may not have been necessary. With respect to turtle management, there were no suggestions regarding relocation of turtle nests. Such relocation, could do more to increase the productivity of nesting turtles than all the lighting restrictions combined. This statement is based upon my review of literature included in the attached document titled "Analysis of NCWRC Objections to Relocation". Finally, with respect to the Southern Environmental Law suite, much is made of the so called failure to meet performance measures. The referenced performance measures were added after the fact in an effort to appease environmental groups. The primary problem with the performance measures is that they do not clearly define what constitutes lack of control on the part of the park service. Quite simply, if the birds don't show up, you will not meet the goal for fledged chicks. The performance measures need to be revisited and rewritten so as to minimize the possibility of future litigation that is based upon factors beyond the park service's control.
- CAHA IS A REC AREA NOT A WILDLIFE REFUGE..DREGE SPOILES IN THE SOUND FOR NESTING BIRDS
- I am all for protecting wildlife. I am a nature lover and support organizations that have animals best interest, not their own hidden agendas. People and animals can co-exist, and in many situations thrive on one another. This National Seashore was created as a Recreational area for people. Animals and Birds, one in the same to me, thrive in this area. They have already created Pea Island Wildlife and Refugee. Stop trying to keep people off their National Park. In many instances, see the old salt pond off Cape Point, when you prohibit people, the birds will stay away. People prevented the growth of vegetation which is prime hiding spots for predators. Now that people are not allowed there, the birds are not there either. When I was a child this was one of the most fascinating areas of the entire seashore, it would absolutely be covered with birds, now they steer clear. I may not be well spoken or written, but the bottom line I wish to convey is, PEOPLE AND ANIMALS CAN CO-EXIST, stop trying to separate the two to a point where people can not enjoy a National Park. This is why this area was created to begin with, for PEOPLE. The animals have plenty of areas to thrive and in many cases gravitate to the PEOPLE. PEOPLE are important too.

- Past studies and observation indicate that poor nesting results are a natural occurrence and predation along with other non-human related factors play an important role. Very little if any is an end result of ORV use and presence.
- ORVs, pets and some pedestrian access should be banned in all areas containing at-risk species of plants and animals. There is no defensible reason to allow humans to destroy a natural area for a temporary pleasure activity. Research should be increased to show where the at-risk areas exist. ORV use and species protection are inherently contradictory. One cannot be maintained along with the other. There are plenty of areas along North Carolina beaches and elsewhere where vehicles can go without destroying natural habitat in an area that is intended to be protected and managed as a natural area for future generations.
- To much emphasis is being put on limiting ORV access and increasing the likelihood of access denial. There is a National Wildlife Refuge on Hatteras Island. It's called Pea Island NWR. Denying access to tax paying citizens in the form of resource protection is no longer acceptable. All beach users care about the park and do things to protect the park like removing trash, etc. We understand and respect the need for resource protection but to continually deny access and increase closures is un-American.
- Regarding Part II Regulatory Framework under Threatened, Endangered, and Other Protected Species, the e.g. needs to be an i.e. and everything definitively listed that defines these "other protected species". An e.g. is too open ended. In III Glossary under U.S. Geological Survey Protocols I have similar concern with "protected species" and "species of concern". All these generic, general, open ended terms need absolute "nuclear safe" definition put to them. Any protection provided to any species must be required by the law and where the law is not clear and rules must be developed, those rules must be based on proven, documented scientific data that is peer credible. Use of so called "expert opinion" is not acceptable. Any data developed should be subjected to peer review and validation prior to being used. The fact that a so called "expert" developed the data is not sufficient to allow its use. Good example of invalid "expert" data is the Vogelsong study.
- This is a Recreation Area not a Wilderness Area. Keep access open! Why not expand use of Cape LookOut National Seashore for wildlife closures where recreation/economic impact is minimal.
- Resource managers working with an established set of protocols should decide what distances and when areas should be closed to visitors for resource protection. Any distances set should be a minimum distances or suggested dates that mean on or before this date. On site/field resource managers should have the immediate discretion to extend protection boundaries, dates etc as resource conditions change in the Seashore. Waiting for NPS managers pre-authorization to change resource protection measures is often to late to remedy problems and works to the detriment of the resource. Special interest groups concerned with resource closures should have a standard policy and procedures to express their views. They or the public should not interfere or debate resource decisions in the field with resource managers. Controversial resource closures that restrict ORV use should have law enforcement rangers present to allow resource managers to do their jobs without harassment. Resource decisions should be made with all available data with careful consideration given to historical areas and populations of the past. The Park should engage and seek environmental NGO's and other groups (universities and individuals) that have professionals with expertise, data collecting abilities and resource recovery backgrounds that could assist the Park with resource management. Driving should not be permitted in areas where vehicle lights will shine into nesting and roosting areas. Institute better, frequent and more comprehensive bird surveys. Initiate research into causes and solutions of bird decline, and how ORV use affects birds and how it may be mitigated. Reevaluate USGA protocols. Populations of specific shorebirds have further declined since this document was formulated. Institute pedestrian corridors and shuttles through sensitive areas. Create a new IPSMP. Formulate an ORV/IPSPM management plan that restricts political meddling from interfering with resource management. Design optimum year round foraging and resting areas. Specific areas are associated with specific resource protection concerns. Users should be made aware of the resource protection measures and restrictions associated with those areas. Eliminate ORV sound side access
- I want the plants and animals conserved while still allowing citizens to freely use their park. Over the last 25 years, CHNS has muddled it's way to the "status quo". It would seem to be reasonably successful. Large numbers of people enjoy the park's beaches. At the same time, substantial amounts of land have been set aside for wildlife. The vast majority of the island is inaccessible to ORVs - Pea Island, most of the sound front and the interior. Major change is unwarranted. Incremental change, accompanied by objective research to determine whether the changes are effective, is warranted. Many of the options in sections 6A - 6D are very complicated. These proposals should be accompanied

by a simple, honest description of their intended effect. For example, section 6.A.23 reads: "Establish pre-nesting closures for American oystercatcher and colonial waterbirds used during the past 3 years outside areas on spits/points already closed for piping plover nesting. As more data becomes available, the definition of historical habitat would be expanded, up to a maximum of 10 years." Whoever wrote this clearly knows what their intended effect is. But I don't. Simple, honest descriptions are needed if we're going to have an informed process.

- Far too many questions for the average user of this park. The park is a recreational area, not a resource protection area. Any closure should only take place when a nest has been observed not when a nest is anticipated. Any closure beyond what is dictated by law is unjust and restricts the access of visitors to the park. The NPS role is enforce and follow existing guidelines, not re-write them.
- Section 6A Questions: 1-8 Establishing closure and buffers is most often not effective although some may be. Closures should only take place for endangered species and immediately removed when the species is no longer present. 'Recent breeding areas' have no definition. Closure statements should also have removal statements. Compliance with ESA requirements must be met but expansions must also include reductions. Pre-nesting closures for colonial waterbirds are not required as they are non-endangered Closures should only take place when a nest is actually located – not in anticipation of nesting. No seabach amaranth was sighted in 2007, but closures are appropriate if found. It would not be effective to close additional resource areas during breeding seasons because of ORV's. Repeated studies have shown that pedestrians cause more disturbance than ORV's. 13 is definitely effective. 14-16 are not effective. These protocols were written by a former NPS Superintendent and called for the most restrictions with no regard for visitors or the economy of the area. Option A: These closures for non-endangered species are excessive in size and are not a requirement by any law or NPS-wide directive. Adaptive management may be effective. 18-30 are not effective. Excessive closures in size and frequency beyond dictated law is unjustified and limit visitor enjoyment of the Park. Pre-nesting closures are not effective as birds may nest anywhere and are unaware of NPS closed areas. ESA protected species do not require excessive closures. Protect nests and chicks – not birds exhibiting territorial or courting behavior. The NPS's task is to follow the guidelines of the ESA – not re-write them! Section 6B Questions: 1-6 are not effective. Management by padlock is unacceptable. The CHNRS is not a Wilderness Area – it is a Recreational Area established by law for public use. 7-8 may be effective but require clarification. Any expansion of ORV use during the time of closures is effective. Pedestrians are proven to cause the most damage. The 10-meter protected area is not an effective use of NPS funds since the dune line will change with tides and storms. Section 6C Questions: 1-7 are not effective as these are the areas most visited in the entire Seashore. Large closures will promote the growth of vegetation that destroys the habitat favored by many species of birds. Closure of this type reflect poorly on the NPS and appears to be padlock management. The distance to the spots from parking is excessive and would negate any pedestrian use by visitors. Section 6D Questions: None of these questions are effective with the exception of #3 which may be effective. False Turtle crawls at Cape Hatteras are under the acceptable ratio of 1:1. Lighting standards are not applicable here as there are no known NPS structures where lightning reaches the beach. Adopting Turtle nests may be effective if they are relocated to safe areas above the 'forces of the ocean' where observation and management would be cost effective and ensure successful hatches. Final Comments on Section 6: Historical data over a ten-year period will prove that current polices are a dismal failure. For the period 2000-2006, 46.1% of nests were lost which include those that hatched less than 20% of the eggs. Predation is primarily from ghost crabs, and only the Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge has solved the problem by 'caging' the nests.
- It appears to me that the current management of the Seashore is striking a fair balance between orv use and the many wildlife considerations. For many years this was not the case and wildlife considerations were given an unfairly heavy weighting. Specifically I recommend: Move turtle nests away from storm threatened areas and away from extremely high traffic orv areas. There are currently many passive areas available for this including Pea Island. Just as the California Condor was incubated and reared in captivity attempt this same procedure with the Piping Plover. For the many thousands of dollars per egg that is currently being spent on the plover in this marginal habitat divert some of that money to test this concept. Enabling legislation language is somewhat ambiguous. Despite a strong position regarding primitive and rustic seashore the original concept was to include the words "recreation area. The concept of protection areas, buffers, and closures must be judiciously applied to be fair. One group would shut down the entire seashore for its potential use by wildlife including fowl. Under the current system protective buffers and signs are set up when there is indication of potential nesting behavior. The areas used at one time during the past ten years cover an awful lot of territory. Orvs take an unfair amount of criticism whereas foot traffic can be even more detrimental. Reclaim from encroaching vegetation the natural nesting areas which existed in the past and which have been lost due as much to policy changes as to nature. 50 years ago the inlet area was flat and essentially grassless but now there is flora virtually everywhere except on the tide line reclaim some of that area for the birds. Closing of

Cape point, Oregon Inlet spit, south point Ocracoke could well result in the closing of a number of businesses which depend on vacationers who utilize these most popular locations in the seashore.

- Difficult questions to answer but many locals have better knowledge of what is needed than of the govt. wildlife agencies. You have to consider everything, the economy, the people, the animals, the birds etc. Many agencies want to protect one thing and nothing else. All can exist with good guidelines and expert analysis.
- The continued well being of the bird populations on the CHNS islands is an important factor in the continued ecological/economical health of the islands. Tourists and locals all enjoy the sight of colonial birds on the beach with their fledglings. In our experience closures for colonial birds are well respected by ORV operators and pedestrians. Excessive closures for piping plovers seem hard to justify as CHNS is not a strong breeding ground for these birds.. For the amount of effort expended to track and make sure these birds and their nestlings are safe, it would seem more effective to eliminate all feral cats and control raccoon populations in these areas. This would have a greater impact on the survival rate of chicks than banning ORVs from the beach. The Turtle Patrol is an expected part of any early summer morning on the beach. Turtle nests are well defined, well respected, and turtle egg mortality rates cannot be blamed on ORV traffic. Nests could possibly be relocated and fenced for protection from natural predators. Turtle friendly lighting issues should be addressed by the villages with lights left on all night by renters who aren't paying the electric bill and don't realize this is an issue
- **TOO COMPLICATED AND TOO MANY DETAILS FOR A LAYMAN TO COMMENT. IN GENERAL, USE THE LEAST RESTRICTIVE MEASURES COMPATIBLE WITH GOALS OF MAINTAINING VIABILITY OF GENUINELY ENDANGERED ANIMALS AND PLANTS.**
- The Park should use the best science available when enacting buffer zones around nesting species. If science-based studies within the Park later demonstrate that some restrictions could be lessened (e.g. smaller buffer areas during certain times of the breeding season), than management could adapt accordingly. Due in part to the size of the Seashore and the necessary manpower required, we do not think that increased monitoring can replace sufficient buffer zones to protect many of the natural resources within the Park. Protection for non-breeding waterbirds needs to be clearly defined. Bayside areas should be closed and there should be adequate protection of some roosting and foraging habitat. Remain flexible in protection of natural resources at the Park given that barrier islands are inherently dynamic. In development of survey protocols, we recommend that biologists with CAHA continue to report numbers of non-breeding piping plovers to the NCWRC waterbird biologist for inclusion in the coast-wide shorebird database. If done in conjunction with proper management, a vehicle permit system could help alleviate pressure on the resources. Education regarding responsible driving in order to protect natural resources and visitor safety should be a required component of a vehicle permit system. Night driving is particular hazardous for coastal birds and sea turtles. We recommend closing beaches to night driving or perhaps having a designated night fishing area if there is an appropriate site available. Overall, we feel increased public education will help to raise awareness, but alone is not sufficient to protect the natural resources. Information on the negative impacts of feeding gulls and other wildlife should be included in education programs and the feeding of wildlife near nesting sites should be prohibited. Given the difficulties of enforcement, there should be sufficient penalties necessary to dissuade drivers from violating rules. Penalties should be stiffer for repeated or severe violations. It is important to recognize that increasing the reproductive success of coastal birds and other biota at the seashore will greatly benefit all user groups by helping to prevent further listing of species. Additionally, if birds are successful during their first nesting attempts, the amount of time when nesting closures are needed will be reduced. Lastly, we want to commend the Park for their continued efforts to manage predation by non-native and over abundant predators. Along with increases in human disturbance, increased predation is undoubtedly contributing to declines in waterbird populations. Literature Cited. Erwin, R.M. 1989. Responses to human intruders by birds nesting in colonies: experimental results and management guidelines. *Colonial Waterbirds* 12: 104-108. Rogers, J.A. and H.T. Smith. 1995. Set-back distances to protect nesting bird colonies from human disturbance in Florida. *Conservation Biology* 9(1): 89-99.
- Park should set up long distance observation and education experiences for visitors often during active breeding periods with interpreters and several good spotting scopes. Terms should be defined, i.e. "sustainable habitat", etc. Term "closure" should only be used if an area can not even be observed from an area monitoring camera. All programs to be successful will require sustained funding at a needed level. Much vehicle-free habitat/beach will be needed until sustainable populations are reached (see Plover Recovery Plan) then increase pedestrian access and NPS controlled beach taxi type services.

- CAHA currently relies on both the questionable Vogel song survey & the USGS Protocols. Both are either invalid or do not apply. The USGS protocols were developed with no concern of recreational uses or NPS expenditures. These protocols therefore do not apply to CAHA. A completely different USGS study is needed to accommodate recreational use & consider NPS costs & local economic impact if they are to be considered valid & useable. As is, the protocols are only a “wish list” for environmentalists. NPS should commission a new USGS study for protection of species, including recreational use, economic impact & NPS costs. NPS should also discard the Vogel song survey as tainted.
- This above statement should reference to species protection options not ORV options as ORV options is in the ORV section. Look at historical data and do not look at just one year at a time. Look at turtle results for the last ten years and you will see very plainly that current policies are a dismal failure. No one, not even NCWRC has done this. They did not even know that they were missing information and NPS could not find it either (no one has false crawl information for 2000 nor did they know that it was missing until I asked for it). For the years 2000-2006 (current sea turtle policy period) this park has lost 41.82% of sea turtle nests laid here and if you add nests that hatched under 20% of the eggs in the nest the lost figure goes to 46.1%. This is certainly not a record to be proud of and no one is calling for a change, not NPS, NCWRC or USF&W. The Appendix options for sea turtles state only one option that will deal with the greatest problem here and that is "Relocate nests imperiled by impending erosion or flooding." Initial results of beach temperature transects at this park show that there is no dramatic difference in sand temperature at the high tide line and at the dune toe so nests can be relocated and not have a significant effect on the sex ratio of hatchlings. As far as egg predation goes the greatest threat comes from ghost crabs and only Back Bay has a solution to this which is to relocate nests in a cage. Predation of hatchlings comes primarily from ghost crabs as well and only a system like that used at Pea Island will work (a volunteer program that essentially escorts the hatchlings to the ocean). No one has opened their eyes and looked around to see what others are doing to help sea turtles. False crawls at CAHA are not out of line when one looks at over one year. Over the last ten years the false crawl ratio here is lower than at Cape Lookout where they do not have seven ocean front villages, do not have three ocean piers and do not have anywhere near the human activity on their beaches (ORV or pedestrian). Yes, 2007 false crawls were high but 20 of more of these false crawls were in bird closures and ORV's can not be blamed for these. In 2007 Pea Island also had a high rate of false crawls (17 false crawls and 14 nests) and they do not have any villages, piers or ORV's. Let's not blame everything on ORV's, especially when it is not true. I object to the term “Passive Recreation” being used to refer to all beaches except ORV beaches as almost all users of ORV's also engage in the activities described in your definition of “Passive Recreation” when on the beaches. Since all the beaches of the Seashore are recreation beaches I would suggest that the distinction between beaches be limited to “Lifeguard” or “Swim” beaches, “Multi-use” beaches and “ORV Multi-use” beaches which will fairly describe all beaches. Visitors may interpret passive recreation as limited to sunbathing and sitting in a chair only. Would all visitors get an instruction sheet giving them your definition of passive recreation? Multi-use is a widely understood term and passive recreation is not. Any workbooks that are submitted run the chance of containing misinformation as the maps presented with the original workbook were in error and misleading and thus any answers based on the original maps are useless. Only the online maps have been adjusted and not those in printed workbooks so corrections made online can not be assumed to have reached those who got printed versions. Even the maps online are still not accurate since some areas are not labeled correctly. You can not depend on any answer relating to the status quo or changes to ORV driving areas unless the map errors are pointed out by the respondent.
- The “interim plan” is working, a tweaks here and there could improve it also. Nothing new has been tried. How about clearing the grasses and brush on the interiors of the spits and at the Point? The pond at the Point is an untapped resource for feeding shore birds. Clear the shore of this area on the south and west sides. Clear the brush between the pond and ramp 45. There is a huge amount of valuable feeding resources in that area. At Hatteras spit the inside area should also be cleared, this will allow the birds to nest/rest farther from the shoreline. The same thing can be done at Oregon Inlet, clear the interior of brush and grasses. This will allow birds to feed at the small creeks and puddles that would form. Also clear brush from all other bird enclosures. In the fall & winter take down the closure fences, let the ORVs drive in that area. This will help keep regrowth down and create areas for feeding spots to develop. Look what happened to the puddle that developed near the end of the pole road on the sound side after Isabel. Because ORVs were blocked from using that piece of road, a rich stew of bugs and aquatic life grew in that puddle. Birds fed there so much, NC Audubon wanted to preserve the puddle and not let that section of road be used again. This could be recreated many times on the insides of the Point and spits. We have to do something. It has been proved over and over, doing nothing, does not work. 6.A Closures should only be for endangered species and removed when the species are no longer present. Compliance with ESA requirements must be met but expansion must also include reductions. Pre-nesting closures for colonial waterbirds are not required as they are non-

endangered. Closures should only be when a nest is located, not in anticipation of nesting as birds nest anywhere they want and are unaware of closed areas designated for them by NPS. Enclosures for non-endangered species that are excessive in size and are not a requirement by any law or NPS wide directive have no regard for the visitors and economics of the area. The task of NPS is to follow the guidelines of the ESA, not to rewrite the ESA.

- No seabeach amaranth has been sighted in the Park in 2006 and 2007, but closures would be appropriate if any were found. Not effective to close additional resource areas during breeding season to ORVs. Repeated studies show pedestrians cause more disturbance than ORVs. Even NPS' own reports (see 2007 Report from NPS Superintendent, dated 1/31/08) stated that of the 292 violations of disturbances of resource enclosures, 249 were by humans, 25 by ORV, 17 by dogs and 1 by horse (probably with rider), that's only 8.5% by ORVs even though ORVs are blamed and restricted for everything. 6.B. Management by padlock is unacceptable. The Park here is not a Wilderness area, it is a Recreational Area established for public use. 6.C Options for Spits, Capt Point and South Beach. These areas are the most visited in the entire Seashore. Large closures will promote the growth of vegetation that destroys the habitat favored by many species of birds. Closure of this type reflect poorly on the NPS and appears to be padlock management. The distance to the spits and Cape Point from parking areas is excessive and would negate any pedestrian use by visitors. 6.D Adopting turtle nests may be effective if they are relocated to safe areas above the "forces of the ocean" where observation and management would be cost effective and ensure successful hatches. Historical data over a 10 year period will prove that current policies are a dismal failure. For the period 2000-2006, 46.1% of nests were lost which include those that hatched less than 20% of their eggs. Predation is primarily from ghost crabs and only Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge has solved the problem by "caging" the nests.
- The park resources (birds, turtles, plants, etc.) are precious and must be protected. Unspoiled beaches are being lost making areas like Cape Hatteras even more important, especially for wild visitors looking for a place to breed or eat or nest. Most of these species are not especially adaptable but the human species us. I will accept inconvenience, such as closures, in exchange for knowing the wildlife is being protected. They should have first choice. The NPS, as part of its legal and moral obligation, must start to give them maximum protection.
- Studies have shown ORV use does not harm the beach. The size and length of closures have been increasing with little or no results in increasing the bird population. The refusal to move turtle nests allowing them to be flooded by ocean waters is a disgrace. Better to have live females than dead eggs.
- With the world's climate changing I would also to expect changes in species habitats. So what if a species is dwindling in this area. This may be because they are migrating to other areas more suitable for them at this time of climate change.
- If we want species to be protected, we should do those things that will help the species. Some actions might be: put protective cages over nests. ORV's don't ruin nests and kill eggs, predators do. -fence off turtle nests and keep all off them. Relocate nests that are laid in high risk areas. -control access by USFWS, NPS, and other civilian volunteers- they kill more plovers than ORV's or fisherman. -you should study objectively what impact, if any, ORV's have on wildlife. I feel that predators is the biggest cause of lost fledglings, not vehicle traffic.
- The key to all of this species protection options is to maintain an ORV/pedestrian corridor. Emphasis on a very, very small segment of wildlife (birds) rather than public recreation is curious since only a few chicks (maybe 10-15 per season) survive. We pour a large amount of resources (people, money, materials) into a project which is doomed to failure. The island simply is not a natural habitat for nesting and breeding of the aforementioned birds. Never has been-even before 4wd. The turtles-ok;but, this needs a higher form of management to diminish aggravation to the public considering their survival rate. Here again the ORV corridor is important as noted in section I.
- The best way to protect young species is by protection from natural predators. I have have seen seagulls pick a scrap piece of bait off the beach when it was threw there with no gulls in sight. Small chick during the day with little or no cover have no chance against such keen predators! I have traveled to the Outer banks for 30 years. In 30 year only seen 1 or 2 people of ORV driving in a manner which should have been stopped. 99% of ORV's respect and obey the NP regulations. Enforcement of the offenders with citizen reporting could aid the rangers in enforcement. I spend 30 days of a year at the Outer Banks which provide one of a kind experiences for myself and my family. To prevent

ORV on park properties would void that experience. The National Seashore is a park for the people of the nation not a wilderness area!

- 6A3 I answered as definitely effective but in the past more than 150' have been used. One time ¼ of a mile was roped off which was not necessary. If types of protection is used in the future I am against it, this is where common sense is needed.
- 6A23 The most of this section has to deal with closing more of the beaches. It looks like you want to push humans out of the park. If you check your records you will find out most of the problem are not caused by the people who use the park.
- 6a25 These birds do not need this much room. If you use your rangers properly you do not need all this space. Keep a reasonable distance for all birds.
- 6c4 and 6c5 . CH says it is closed to public and C5 says closed to ORV. The public could be in ORV to me they are the same. And I can not see closing in the summer.
- In my opinion, all decisions about nesting areas, buffers, resource areas, turtle nesting areas and other environmental concerns should be made by NPS biologists or other trained professionals. However, I strongly believe that the main purpose of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore is for the enjoyment of the American taxpayer. Furthermore, I am convinced that without the miles of 4-wheel drive accessible beaches, Hatteras Island would not have developed as it has at the current time. Many of the year-round residents on the Hatteras Island depend on the sport fishing industry for their livelihood. Closing or severely restricting the NPS beaches would be a tremendous blow to the island economy and would deprive the area of one of its main tourist attractions. I currently have part ownership of a cottage at Salvo, and have enjoyed surf fishing on Hatteras Island since the early 1970's. I have always been thankful that the National Park Service owned and controlled the majority of the seashore between Oregon Inlet and Ocracoke Inlet because federal ownership prevented private development. Unfortunately, the seashore will lose much of its appeal if the beaches are closed to responsible vehicular use. In closing, protecting our environment is important, but the beaches of Hatteras Island have been a major source of recreation and family enjoyment for decades. Is it fair to the taxpayers who use this resource to deprive them of their enjoyment by implementing heavy restrictions on the national seashore?
- The park has done a good job. Don't change anything. They have little control over flying gulls and ghostcrabs...sorry
- Sea Beach Amaranth is not a natural species for this area. Field tests have proven the negative viability of the plant on Hatteras Island. The need for species protection should be tempered by the need for use by the human being. What purpose to preserve and protect particular species if the humans are not allowed to be present to enjoy their existence? Ninety-nine percent of all species that ever existed are now extinct. Extinction is a natural process as is survival of the fittest. How do you stop the natural order? Who determined what species are endangered? Is it the real scientist or those who harbor a fanatical need for a weary cause? I have not met the ORV driver who loads up and goes piping – plover hunting or runs over turtles. I have met people, who trap and kill geese, raccoons and fox. Who are the naturalists? A tempered, even approach is necessary for the cool-minded determination of how to keep preserve the endangered ones including humans. The approach and react method for buffers is a reasonable, scientific method to determine the real disturbance or the avian population. In this method biologist approached a nest and kept coming nearer until the bird reacted, when the bird reacts to the approach the biologist stops-steps backwards 20 feet and places the signage for the buffer zone. It is valid and reasonable. One-third (Pea Island) is already designated for wildlife. You don't see snow geese at Cape Point! Why close everything when any species easily adapts to areas it feels safe in.
- Limiting the use of ORV's on pedestrians on the beach is not going to come close to saving the species that are at the core of this argument. If they truly wanted to save them they would consider collecting the eggs and hatching them and then returning them to the wild. I know that the argument that the use is that these birds would not learn to forage for themselves or know their predators but if you have watched nesting birds you know when they leave the nest they are on their own. The salt pond at Cape Point used to have an area around it free from the brush and the birds used to nest around it. I think that if it was cleaned around it would make a great nesting place. As it is now, it is a great hiding place for the predators.

- This section has more questions than any other, and most ideas/suggestions presented limit, curtail, and eliminate ORV usage and suggest ORV's cause all the nature failures within Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreation Area. I have no issue with the protection of sensitive areas and all flora and fauna found in CHNSP. I have used these beaches since the early 1970's, over 35 years. I have seen foxes, bears, deer, eagles, whales, feral cats, raccoons and all sorts of frogs, snakes and bugs, and enjoyed them all (except bugs). I have also caught by share of fish and witnessed massive dune encroachment by greedy banks and builders who bought up huge tracts of land and then made them private. Likewise, people who have jobs in NPS to protect species are greedy in overstepping bounds needed to afford protection. Killing animals to protect other animals is insane. Plovers who lay eggs here are nesting/nesting way south of their normal summer breeding local to the far north. That's the reason we have so few. Most do migrate, and we turn the entire park upside down to deal with less than 10 pairs of birds, who produced maybe 2-4 fledged chicks. That number will not bring the plover off the endangered species list, nor will it keep the plover from going extinct. Move eggs when laid for 100% hatch/fledge rate. There is no need to treat other shorebirds that are not endangered with fancy protocols. These birds are all doing just fine. Turtles need help. im not going to rant and rave on this. Im enclosing an article that tells how its done, and done right in Costa Rica. Again, people who manage this animal for NPS need to adopt new, sensible protocols that moves eggs. If we don't get eggs to hatch, regardless of sex, all else is really a big waste of time and money.
- Ten pages about birds. Is that all this workbook is about? What about the people enjoying our National Seashore?
- If you want to know how to move wildlife to Pea Island for protection, watch the video, "Fly Away Home" - a 13 year old girl will be glad to teach you.
- Protection of endangered species during nesting season is important however ltes not forget that the park is for the enjoyment of all people not just the well funded, fanatical wildlife groups
- Historical data over a 10 year period will prove that current policies are a dismal failure. For the period 2000-2006. 46.1% of nests were lost which include those that hatched less than 20% of eggs. Predation is primarily from ghost crabs and only Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge has solved the problem by caging the nests.
- I have been coming to the Outer Banks for well over 40 years now and have never to this day seen anyone bother any bird or turtle except to help them if need be. We have always enjoyed our trips to the Outer Banks until the last 10 or so years. Every time we go now there is a new closure at our favorite fishing spot for 1 reason or another, there are few beaches left in N.C. or anywhere else for that matter that is not loaded with houses with no access to the beach for the tax paying public anymore. It would be such a shame to lose our national seashore now to a few birds that just happen to stop by us on their migration route north and south. We have always had these birds around without all these closures. We lived with them and they learned to play around us. I for one have always fished at night, sometimes all night and love to see the shooting stars on the beach at night while fishing. I have also seen the idiots that come out on the beach after the bars close at night, I have phoned in several to 911 but have often wondered why the park service didn't have a published number to call if you say a radio and TV you would discourage a lot of this kind of violations late at night and have a lot more eyes out there helping you look after the beaches we all love.
- I am all for letting the birds have their space while nesting and raising the broods but, if it can be shown that the raising of broods is impossible due to natural unchangeable conditions on Hatteras Seashore, let us not keep the pretence up of wanting to change nature.
- Species protection under the statute and with increased law enforcement
- Closures should be for endangered species and then removed once species is no longer there. Closures should only occur once a nest is found and not for pre-nesting. Recent breeding areas have no definition. No beach closures for seabeach amaranth unless present. Pedestrians cause more disturbance during breeding season than ORVs. Studies have shown this. 6A-13 is definitely effective. The protocols were written by a former superintendent which was very restrictive with little thought for visitors or the local businesses. Option A: the closures are too large and not required by law or NPS wide directive. Prenesting closures are not effective. Also any non-ESA protected species should not get closures. The NPS should follow guidelines of ESA. Remember that it is a Recreation Area not a wildlife refuge.

Additional ORV routes around closures is very effective. It spits closed it promotes vegetation growth which destroys the habitat the birds like. Turtle nest relocation is more effective.

- Occasionally there are situations where ranger involvement is necessary. And limited reasonable staff can handle those. As I've stated – ORV use help keep the beach open from vegetation growth and predators. When the beach is closed like you've done at the pond on the point, predators come and the birds leave. When the pond was open to ORV use thousands of birds were around at all times. Now you rarely see birds there.
- In addition you have no right to trap, kill, or remove predators. That's not your job. That is nature. You don't lock up a storm when it kills baby birds and sea turtle nests and erodes the sand and kills the vegetation. And in most cases we don't need gun-toting rangers to do that to ORV users either!
- Regarding the USFWS: This should be considered. If the fear is that the ORV restrictions would become unbearable than perhaps we need to be careful. But if their restrictions are reasonable and reflect some of the middle of the road conservative responses to this workbook then we should consider them. My understanding is they work with areas to establish an ORV paln. Perhaps, once we have a betterplan with some limitations than we could have the USFWS evaluate our ORV plan in light of species protection on the island. If we fall into a solid compliance area we could proceed.
- The USGS protocols did not take address any economic concerns, which causes it to be immediately flawed! It also did not take costs to NPS into consideration when it came to the alternatives, which causes the only affordable solution for NPS is to ban all human activity! The protocols also offer excessive protection for species that do not require ANY special protection, they are not federally listed as endangered or threatened! This entire document should be disregarded
- Visitors come to the seashore to recreate, (passively if you must!) this includes walking dogs, playing Frisbee, kite flying, kite boarding, campfires, star gazing etc. At this rate what will visitors be permitted to do? They may as well just stop in Virginia Beach and sit on their beach towel there, where there is no room for kite flying or Frisbee throwing and where you can't have a campfire or take your dog on the beach or go on the beach after dark! This does little to enhance visitor experience!
- No mention of vehicle lights and their potential impacts on nesting birds. Stop using filter (slit) fences around the turtle nests. Young hatchlings have been known to become entangled in fabric strands. Fencing confines hatchlings and may increase mortality dur to ghost crab predation (I.e. ghost crabs have them penned in).
- Response to 6-18 through 30. Excessive closure in size and frequency beyond dictated law is unjustified and will limit the visitors enjoyment of the park. Pre-nesting closures are not effective as birds may nest anywhere and are unaware of closed areas designated by the NPS> Non-ESA species do not require excessive closures. Protect nest and chicks not birds exhibiting territorial or courting behavior.
- Large closures will promote the growth of vegetation that destroys the habitat favored by many species of birds. Closures of this type reflect poorly on the NPS and appears to be pad-lock management. The distance to the spits from parking is excessive and would negate any pedestrian use by visitors.
- Species protection should only be implemented when the endangered species (bird, plant, or animal) are verified to be in an area. When that does happen, the proper steps should be taken to protect them. The Park should be available for visitor use and enjoyment as much as possible.
- Wildlife protection is one aspect of CAHA national seashore but not to deprivation of people. Fishing is a key part of many people's vacation experience and ORV is the method of choice. Closing off areas for ongoing breeding and nesting should be done but so should ORV corridors around these areas. Better boundaries would be useful, thoughtfully established routes and closures, and possibly better information about said distributed at Tackle shops and other stores as well as at access points could prove useful. Most of us ORV'ers try to comply but constantly shifting boundaries for sometimes unproven results is frustrating. Close areas when proven necessary not on a guesstimate and remove or minimize closures as soon as possible.

- Instead of spending so much money to keep people off traditional ORV areas, use the money to create wildlife habitat on the core islands and Pea island. Makes those areas that have already been set aside more attractive to wildlife. Man can enhance these areas as the ocean and wind every once in a while flatten them.
- We recommend that the National park Service (NPS) and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) abide by the Interim Protected Species Management Strategy (IPSMS) and include our suggestions within this form. This strategy was developed to minimize the risk to the nesting and wintering piping plovers, American oystercatchers, colonial waterbirds, sea turtles and seabeach amaranth while allowing year-round beach access to the over 2.2 million annual visitors to Cape Hatteras National Seashore. An enormous amount of effort was expended reviewing the scientific literature, studying the local seashore conditions, and negotiating with agencies, user groups and interested parties to develop this detailed plan; therefore, it would not be prudent to develop a new strategy without assessing the current plan. In addition, the data contained within the Cape Hatteras National Seashore 2007 Annual Piping Plover Report suggest the strategy employed during the 2006 and 2007 nesting season (similar in protective measures to the IPSMS) was successful in protecting nesting piping plovers. First, there were more documented nesting pairs of piping plovers in 2006 and 2007 (6 pairs) on Cape Hatteras National Seashore than any of the previous 7 years. This represents 2-fold increase in breeding pairs in the previous 5 years (2001-2005). Second, the piping plover nesting success in 2007 (0.67 chicks/pair) equaled the average nesting success (0.66 chicks/pair) for piping plovers in the 15 year history. Third, the six breeding pairs in 2006 and 2007 exceeded the minimum target of four breeding pairs established in the amended USFWS Biological Opinion dated April 24, 2007. Based on the recent success of the plan, we strongly urge the NPS and the USFWS to implement the measures put forth in the IPSMS and develop a long-term study to assess the success of the plan.

We believe that the success of the IPSMS, and therefore the recovery and protection of piping plovers, American oystercatchers, colonial waterbirds, sea turtles and seabeach amaranth will ultimately rely on a successful outreach and educational program and predator control measures. The local economy depends entirely on the recreational usage of the Cape Hatteras beaches; therefore, the local community has a vested interest in the success of an educational program and the ultimate recovery of the local piping plover population. Organizations like the North Carolina Beach Buggy Association, Outer Banks Preservation Association, Cape Hatteras Anglers Club, and others, along with the local business community comes into contact with most of the recreational users of the Cape Hatteras beaches. Educational materials can be provided to a vast number of beach users through any of these groups and business owners. We fully support the NPS recommendation to inform interested parties, regional newspapers, local tackle shops, and ORV organizations when species closures will be established or reopened. In addition, we recommend offering an educational program focusing on nesting shorebirds and colonial waterbirds, including the piping plover and American oystercatcher, to the local community. In turn, the local community can provide this education along with any brochures to the seasonal recreational users. We anticipate that the IPSMS, with clearly defined annual closures, time-restricted seasonal closures, and recreational user access corridors, will be easy to promote and implement and be more successful than approaches with observer defined nest closures, observer defined time restrictions, and unwarranted beach closures.

Predation of piping plover and other shorebird and colonial waterbird nests appears to be an important factor in reducing the nesting success on Cape Hatteras. Predation has been identified as a major factor limiting the reproductive success of piping plovers nesting on the Atlantic Coast (Burger 1987, MacIvor 1990, and Patterson et. al. 1991). Predators of shorebirds and colonial waterbirds, eggs, and chicks that occur within Cape Hatteras National Seashore include red fox, raccoon, opossum, feral dogs and cats, crows, gulls, common grackles, American kestrels, and ghost crabs. We hope that a further reduction in the predator population, along with aggressive predator control measures, should increase the nest productivity for Cape Hatteras piping plovers, other shorebirds and colonial waterbirds.

Despite our best efforts in protecting piping plovers, it may not be feasible to attain some of the reproductive measures observed in other states. For example, low productivity might be expected for the North Carolina piping plover population as peripheral populations are less stable with increased local extinction and turnover rates when compared to more central (and abundant) and relatively stable populations. We surmise that the North Carolina plovers may have more interspecific competition for space and food than plovers in other areas and this may contribute to the low reproductive success. A caveat of this edge of range theory is that presence of the species within the edge might be underrepresented; however, in the case of piping plovers, thorough surveys for this species occur annually and piping plovers are not likely overlooked. The long-term data support this assumption as low productivity has been recorded on North Carolina beaches since 1989 and has remained low during each subsequent year even as recreational usage of the beaches has dramatically increased (USFWS 2003-2003 and USFWS 2004).

From 1992 to 2004, North Carolina has recorded the lowest productivity (chicks fledged per nest) in each year of the study with exception to 2002, when the productivity for New Hampshire piping plovers measured only 0.14 chicks fledged per nest (USFWS 2003-2003 and USFWS 2004). For comparison, each U.S. State on the Atlantic Coast has recorded a 10-year productivity estimate between 1.07 to 1.69 chicks fledged per nest and the Atlantic Canada population has a 10-year productivity estimate of 1.62 chicks fledged per nest; whereas, piping plovers in North Carolina have a drastically lower 10-year productivity estimate of only 0.46 chicks fledged per nest (USFWS 2003-2003 and USFWS 2004). This low fledging success is seen on Cape Hatteras (0.66 chicks fledged per nest between 1994-2007) and Cape Lookout (0.42 chicks fledged per nest between 1989-2004) (National Park Service: Cape Hatteras National Seashore 2007, National Park Service: Cape Lookout National Seashore 2004).

- As per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate.
- With respect to recreational uses, if any changes are made, they should be to reduce the number and size of resource closures. Last season, the closures were so extensive that users could not even see the birds being protected.
- With respect to habitat management, these types of activities are part of the Piping Plover recovery plan thus are relevant. Furthermore, the benefits to be derived from proactive habitat management will accrue to other bird species and recreational uses. For example, as a result of the limited amount of storm activity witnessed during the past two years. As a result, the water behind the alternate route to the point dissipated exposing mud flats. These mud flats provided a rich food source for piping plovers and a variety of other birds. Furthermore, since the birds did much of their foraging on these mud flats, it was not necessary to restrict access to the popular areas around the point. Had the park service managed this extension of salt pond in previous years, breeding success rates may have been higher and the 2005 and 2006 closures of popular recreational areas at the point may not have been necessary.
- With respect to turtle management, there were no suggestions regarding relocation of turtle nests. Such relocation, could do more to increase the productivity of nesting turtles than all the lighting restrictions combined.
- Finally, with respect to the Southern Environmental Law suite, much is made of the so called failure to meet performance measures. The referenced performance measures were added after the fact in an effort to appease environmental groups. The primary problem with the performance measures is that they do not clearly define what constitutes lack of control on the part of the park service. Quite simply, if the birds don't show up, you will not meet the goal for fledged chicks. The performance measures need to be revisited and rewritten so as to minimize the possibility of future litigation that is based upon factors beyond the park service's control.
- All parties should enforce and abide by the IPSMS as written and approved. The time and effort put into this document should be recognized and hasty changes should not be accepted without clear, proven data (not supposition). Give the IPSMS an opportunity to either succeed or fail. Let the IPSMS and ESA dictate your enforcement. You cannot/should not attempt to rewrite the ESA at CAHA. If you are going to use the MBTA to force closures you need to use this same logic at all parking lots, airstrips, exhibits, etc. In reviewing turtle and bird data populations and movement, studies must include surrounding areas and reflect the total populations. New islands created, storm event changes and possibly global warming are bring about changes not associated with visitor populations. There needs to be more correlation of weather events to nesting successes.
- I believe the CAHA NPS staff works hard to balance recreation and resource protection given limited budget and staffing. I think Mike Murray is doing an excellent job as superintendent. He is taking the time to work with the locals and visitors to understand everyone's viewpoint. Historical data over a 10 year period will prove that current policies are a dismal failure. For the period 2000-2006 46.1% of nests were lost which include those that hatched less than 20% of the eggs. Predation is primarily from ghost crabs and only Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge has solved the problem by 'caging' the nests.
- Excessive closures in size and frequency beyond dictated law is unjustified and limit the visitors enjoyment of the park. Pre-nesting closures are not effective as birds may nest anywhere and are unaware of closed areas designated by NPS. Birds do not follow signs set up by humans. Non ESA protected species do not require excessive closures. The task of NPS is to follow guidelines of the ESA. The NPS should not have it's own set of rules, separate from ESA, for nesting protection. The loss of turtle nest, related hatchings are the result of predators on the island--not human intervention. Rarely do humans cause a problem here. Lots of wildlife naturally eat turtle eggs and young hatchings.

It has been reported in literature I;ve read that Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge has solved the predator problem by 'caging' the nests. Can this be done in our Park?

## **7. Site specific Management: Bodie Island Ranger District**

### **7.A. Ramp 1 to Ramp 4**

**7.A.1** Establish passive recreation area from Ramp 1 to Ramp 2 to ORV use year round. (*status quo*)

#### **May Be Effective**

- May be useful, but NPS should have discretion to be able to reduce this passive area if resource management area at Oregon Inlet reduces that area for ORV use.

#### **Not Effective**

- No easy access
- not year round
- Open area south of Nags head after Sept. 1
- This should be implemented during the peak summer season only and only if the beach is life guarded.
- ramp 1 already has seasonal closure in season
- Open this area to ORV use (except in front of Coquina lifeguarded area). This would take pressure off of ramp 4.
- No good reasons to keep this closed to ORVs off season. Opening ramp 1 & 2 off season would reduce traffic at ramp 4.
- According to the map Ramp 1 to Ramp 2 is seasonally closed, NOT closed year round. The current seasonal closure of ramp 1 to ramp 2 provides sufficient space for passive recreation in season. Year round passive recreation closures are not required and serve one purpose--to limit off-season access to otherwise deserted beaches. See pictures attached "Additional Comments\_off season use".
- Items 7.A.1 thru 7.A.4: (1) Ramp 1 to Coquina beach closed to guarded beach in season only (2) Great expense with little or no value to the users. (3) Reduce closures equal the area closed at Bodie Island split. (4) additional ramp is not needed
- Closed for life guard beach only in season.
- This alternative is not effective for a number of reasons. First, some years ago NPS & USF&W set aside the Peaa Island National Wildlife Refuge and in the years since it's establishment, Pea Island has become a perfect location for "passive recreation". To set aside another location in the proximity of Pea Island would not be effective. Second, The actual area is in the most densely used northern end of CAHA and the need for open recreational use is such that to set this area asice would be to fly in the face of public demand in place the public is located. Third, this is one of the least concentrated areas when it comes to natural resources. Why would NPS seek to set aside for passive recreation an area on the less sensitive side of the natural resource distribution.

**7.A.2** Continue seasonal ORV closure from Ramp 2 to approximately 0.5 mile south of Ramp 2. Create a new ramp at mile 2.5 to facilitate ORV access during the summer season.

#### **Not Effective**

- This is great expense with very little value added. Ramp 2 should be open during the summer months to relieve congestion in the ramp 4 area.
- There are enough ramps now. They are just not used.
- According to the map Ramp 1 to Ramp 2 is seasonally closed. This split between passive use and ORV use areas at Oregon Inlet, provides adequate access for all types of users. I see nothing to be gained by expanding this seasonal closure. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15.
- There should be year round passive areas throughout the Park. High use areas such as near Bodie Island spit should have more restive ORV use and alternate transportation options.
- No new ramps unless a natural process such as a storm creates one.
- Money could be best spent on an interdunal road between Ramps 2 and 4 with an access road at mile 3. Leave Ramp 2 open year around but when life guards present only allow traffic to get on interdunal road and enter beach at the access point at mile 3. Seasonal closure at Coquina Beach should only extend south for 0.1 mile.
- Why not just open Ramp 2 to ORVs year round? Why build another ramp 2.5 just for summer season? We have enough ramps now, let's use them.

**7.A.3** Reduce the seasonal ORV closure to 0.1 mile south of Ramp 2 to provide more ORV area to offset areas closed at Bodie Island Spit during the breeding season.

**Definitely Effective**

- When/if the spit is closed adding extra room north is good.

**Not Effective**

- When Bodie Island spit is closed other areas should be open to compensate. A checker board closure rotation would be beneficial.
- Open up to Ramp 1 to offset closed area at Bodie Is. Spit
- Reduced closure should EQUAL areas closed
- According to the map Ramp 1 to Ramp 2 is seasonally closed. Continuing this closure to .1 mile south of Ramp 2, represents an increase in the closure NOT a decrease. The seasonal closure from ramp 1 to ramp 2 is sufficient to, provide adequate access for all types of users. I see nothing to be gained by expanding this seasonal closure. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15.
- Passive areas should not be reduced because of ORV areas become closed due to resource protection measures. Decide on the areas and leave them alone, it is much more transparent and systematic management tool.

**(No Selection)**

- Reduce the closure to size equal to size of Bodie Island spit

**7.A.4** Establish the 0.5 mile between Ramp 2 and a newly established Ramp 2.5 as a year-round, passive recreation area.

**May Be Effective**

- need ORV way around

- Establish one ramp at Bodie Island with year round ORV areas and passive recreational areas.

**Not Effective**

- New ramp 2.5 is not necessary. Just open ramp 2.
- Expand parking at ramp 2 so passive recs have toilets.
- At present, Ramp 1 to Ramp 2 is seasonally closed. This split between passive use and ORV use areas at Oregon Inlet, provides adequate access for all types of users. I see nothing to be gained by expanding this seasonal closure. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15.

**7.A.5** Expand existing parking areas around Ramps 1 and 2 and provide pedestrian access to the beach.

**May Be Effective**

- if closure is kept seasonal in the area

**Definitely Effective**

- Expansion at both Ramp 1 and Ramp 2 would be very beneficial and would provide much needed relief.
- Install porta-potties at ramp 1 with the larger parking lot. Then in the off season open ramp 1 & 2 to ORVs.
- Expanding parking at Ramp 2 to the North is needed for expanded numbers of visitors and access to the bath house

**Not Effective**

- Expand parking at Ramp2 but when I used to go to Nags Head beaches Ramp 1 was not used much so I would say expanding parking there may not be beneficial. Parking in Nags Head and northern villages is far different from Hatteras Island where there are no public parking lots except at ramps.

**7.B. Ramp 4 to Bodie Island Spit**

**7.B.1** Continue current practice of open access, subject to resource closures and weather/tide conditions. (*status quo*)

**Definitely Effective**

- 7.B.1 is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003.
- Need an interdunal trail from Ramp 4 to Oregon Inlet to bypass tidal conditions.

**May Be Effective**

- Drivers should be permitted to enter at their own risk
- Establish an ORV route behind the dunes at ramp 4 to the spit open all year. Clearing grasses & brush on the interior of the spit will benefit the birds.
- Need to add an inter dunal bypass around the narrow beach just South of Ramp 4

### **Not Effective**

- Access should be improved via interdunal route.
- Ramp 4 needs to be open year round.
- Seasonal and non-seasonal closures are arbitrary and antiquated and don't provide year round passive areas.
- Closing the spit is not acceptable. It should be open year round. An interdunal road from the dunes to the tidal flats would be effective
- The current corridor policy has allowed grass to reduce bird habitat. Either vegetation must be reduced by chemicals or ORV's in the winter as used to be done when breeding was successful. Keeping the beach open to ORV use is most beneficial. (Comment repeated for 7.B.2)
- Interdunal roads from Ramp 4 to tidal flats would be effective boardwalks would not be effective as distances are excessive. Restoration of habitat due to excessive closures should be done ASAP to benefit breeding birds.

**7.B.2** Allow ORV use from Ramp 4 to Oregon Inlet year round.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Ramp 4 to OI should be open year round
- This is the most used ramp and beach usage area close to Nags Head-Kill Devil Hills & Kitty Hawk. Taking access away from the spit crowds too many into too small a space up towards ramp 2.

### **May Be Effective**

- On limited and controlled basis unless proven detrimental to species protection
- Vehicle should not be driving on narrow beaches.

### **(No Selection)**

- 7.B.2 is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003.

### **Not Effective**

- Research shows inlets are needed habitat for park T/E species

**7.B.3** Close spit to ORV use during breeding season or summer months.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Provide shuttle service to spit when appropriate with respect to the resource.

### **Not Effective**

- Alternative would be a checkerboard rotation at OI spit. Restoration of habitat lost to birds due to closing should be addressed immediately
- Interdunal Road would be better.
- Close beaches by a as need basis

- not effective unless an active nest is located
- If the grasses were cleared around the large shallow inlet(pond) near the bridge birds would have a valuable feeding area open for them.
- As per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate. If any changes are made, they should be to reduce the number and size of resource closures.
- Provide interdunal road around closures
- Again you create major portions of the beach or sound side closed that are highly used by recreational visitors and in a highly washover area. Instead why don't you partner with Corp. of Engineer and other entities to provide more and larger dredge spoil islands in the sound that can be created, maintained and closed to public as resting and breeding areas for this wild life. The area of Cape Hatteras Seashore is a shoulder area for both nesting and wintering plovers and be at the edge of their habitat makes it a poor choice for the high cost of trying to increase their population here. Instead you can take Portsmouth Island who only sees a small percentage of visitors compared to this recreational seashore to do these closures. Portsmouth has little dune structure and many better areas to promote nest and wintering habitats. Also in the vegetated portion of this area that have become unfit for breeding habitat open portions of them each winter to ORV and encourage use of the vegetated area opened to expand the habitat needed for breeding the next season. (Comment repeated for 7.B.4 – 7.B.5)
- Not necessary if you deal with grass issue in interior of spit. The current corridor policy has allowed grass to reduce bird habitat. Either vegetation must be reduced by chemicals or ORV's in the winter as used to be done when breeding was successful. (comment repeated for 7.B.4)
- This will create bad feelings with visitors. Vacationers from the North Beaches (Nags Head, Kill Devil Hills) are the primary visitors at this beach.

#### **No Selection**

- Sound side of the spit & the "BAIT POND" are the safest areas for families with small children

**7.B.4** Close a portion of the spit year round to ORV use. Allow pedestrian access, except in resource closures.

#### **May Be Effective**

- But appears not to provide adequate species protection
- If plovers and other spit breeders continuously use the area.

#### **Not Effective**

- Too far for most pedestrians to walk
- Restoration of habitat lost to birds due to closing should be addressed immediately. Alternative would be a checkerboard rotation at OI spit.
- Pedestrian access would be underutilized due to extreme distance from parking areas.
- Close the portions that are not safe for ORV
- Pedestrians(people) flush birds. ORVs do not(at least to the same extent). ORV users mostly stay near the surf. Very few use the inland portions except to do do-nuts. Enforcement.

- I see no need to expand passive recreational areas from Ramp 4 south. Designating ORV access from Ramp 4 south is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003. With respect to resource considerations, as per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate. If any changes are made, they should be to reduce the number and size of resource closures.
- Provide interdunal road around closures

**7.B.5** Close the whole spit to ORV use year round. Allow pedestrian access, except in resource closures.

**May Be Effective**

- If data proves this would be the most effective way to improve nesting rates and success then yes.
- But unlikely to have much pedestrian appeal and use

**Not Effective**

- Pedestrian can cause damage.
- This is a major destination attraction and would have a negative impact on the economy. Alternative would be a checkerboard rotation at OI spit. Do not close the ORV access. Restoration of habitat lost to birds due to closing should be addressed immediately
- Pedestrian access would be underutilized due to extreme distance from parking areas.
- This is a waste of valuable ORV space. The distance is too far to walk. With the vegetation crowding the birds to the ocean beach there is less room for humans.
- I see no need to expand passive recreational areas from Ramp 4 south. Designating ORV access from Ramp 4 south is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003. With respect to resource considerations, as per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate. If any changes are made, they should be to reduce the number and size of resource closures.

**7.B.6** Increase parking area at Ramp 4.

**Definitely Effective**

- There are many users who want to fish the inlet rip but lack 4wd.

**May Be Effective**

- Encourages pedestrian use which may be positive
- This would improve the area around ramp 4.
- By all means, if observed usage indicates a need for more parking, do it.
- That makes for a long walk to get to the beach

**Not Effective**

- adequate now

**7.B.7** Establish an interdunal road from **Ramp 4 to the open flats** near the bait pond to provide ORV access to spit when beach is impassible.

**Definitely Effective**

- this would reduce conflict by spreading out users on some days. also would provide safe access/travel during some weather conditions
- Experience from Hatteras Inlet pole road demonstrates that an inland route at the spits minimizes the potential for violations of the dune line by ORVs attempting to escape high tides. Furthermore, an inland route can minimize the impact of resource closures in popular recreational areas such as the Oregon Inlet spit.
- this is necessary in case of emergency.

**(No Selection)**

- Very good idea. While the machine is there clear the grasses and brush so birds will have more room to frolic away from humans.

**May Be Effective**

- But what about impacts to vegetation?

**Not Effective**

- Interdunal roads are inconsistent with Cape Hatteras Enabling Legislation.

**7.B.8** Establish 0.5 - 0.75 mile boardwalk from Ramp 4 through marsh area for pedestrians and anglers to access the spit.

**May Be Effective**

- Parking needs to be expanded if you do that.
- Promotes exercise ad nature viewing . As long as too much habitat is not affected

**Not Effective**

- Big cost small improvement, good for the mosquitoes
- Not cost effective the distance is too far
- too far for most to walk and definitely too far to carry fishing gear
- Make an inner dunal road here for ORV use year round. Humans can walk the road.
- A boardwalk of this length is cost prohibative. Furthermore, a boardwalk of this length would likely be underutilized, especially by anglers and families with young children. Finally, given that Ramp 4 provides ORV access, the boardwalk is not needed.
- I don't think a 3/4 mile boardwalk would get much use.

**7.C. Expand Pedestrian Areas**

**7.C.1** Expand passive recreation area from Ramp 1 south to mile marker (MM) 2.25.

### **May Be Effective**

- It should be limited to Ramp 1 and just to ramp 2. Ramp 1 should be expanded for rec use but terminated at ramp 2. Ramp 2 needs to be open year round to relieve pressure and congestion both north and south of ramp 4.
- If T/E species breeding is sustained through the park. This type habitat may be used for foraging by T/E breeding miles away

### **Not Effective**

- No access except at Coquina Beach
- Not enough passive use to justify a passive recreation area
- Seasonal passive recreational area
- Ramp 1 to lifeguarded area should be open to ORV use to remove pressure from Ramp 4
- This area is not crowded, ramp 1 is under utilized by lack of parking & bathhouse
- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas, provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15.

**7.C.2** Establish a passive recreation area from Ramp 4 north to MM 3.75 to establish a passive recreation area in front of the campground.

### **May Be Effective**

- Seasonal closure during summer only

### **Not Effective**

- Campers and ORVs seems to share this space now with out any problems.
- This areas in front of the campground is under utilized and should managed to say that way. The best solution is to expand Ramp 1 and just to ramp 2. Ramp 1 should be expanded for rec use but terminated at ramp 2. Ramp 2 needs to be open year round to relieve pressure and congestion both north and south of ramp 4.
- Current utilization does not warrant this.
- Seasonal with ORV corridor
- Most campers use ORVs on the beach.. This is valuable ORV area, don't waste it.
- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas, provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15. With respect to passive recreation in front of the Oregon Inlet campground making the 3/4 mile trek in the summer heat from the campground with kids, beach paraphernalia, water, etc. is not conducive to passive use. As a result passive use of these beaches is extremely limited--that is, restriction of the beach to passive recreation is not needed.

## **7.D. Expand ORV Routes in Winter**

**7.D.1** Provide an ORV corridor from Ramp 1 to the inlet during the winter time when the bathhouse is closed, the campground is closed and, at present, there are few pedestrians.

### **Definitely Effective**

- This is stellar solution and would maximize the use of the area in the off season.
- Plus remove the bird enclosure in late fall winter so ORVs can drive on the vegetation.
- According to the map Ramp 1 to the spit is already open off season. Based upon the fact that off-season use of these beaches is extremely light and that off-season users rely heavily on their vehicles for protection for the harsh weather, ORV use from Ramp 1 to the spit is appropriate.
- yes that is a prime fishing area during winter and the local economy will benefit
- Yes. An ORV corridor from ramp1 to Oregon Inlet would provide additional use when the bathhouse is closed

### **Not Effective**

- There are many pedestrians here in winter. Expand passive recreation area year-round throughout the district.
- Passive recreations have as much merit and value to passive users in the winter as the summer. Establish passive areas year round.

## **7.E. Establish an Entrance Station for Either Fee Collection or Capacity Control**

**7.E.1** Staff a year-round entrance station at Ramp 4 that provides capacity control for an established number of vehicles at any one point in time and/or provides education.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Once an ORV carrying capacity is established.

### **May Be Effective**

- Only collect money if the decision to have permit kiosks is done. No cap.
- Capacity control should be primary objective and may be better met by mobile patrols
- Where would you stack the traffic?
- Staff for summer season, weekends and holidays needed. Winter season as needed an/or as determined by NPS staff.
- “Some” enforcement here is important as the spit area can be dangerous during incoming tides. Restrictions may be in order

### **Not Effective**

- Artificial limits not needed
- Access to beaches should remain free and open to all.
- Labor intensive Not needed year round.
- Cost prohibitive, safety issues could arise by stopping them on Highway 12 for processing through an collection site. Better enforcement presence would work better.
- Traffic jam on 12!

- This is a high cost and only creates other problems. This would create a safety issue with traffic to and from hwy 12. All that is needed is better enforcement and education to eliminate any problems. The best solution is to expand Ramp 1 and just to ramp 2. Ramp 1 should be expanded for rec use but terminated at ramp 2. Ramp 2 needs to be open year round to relieve pressure and congestion both north and south of ramp 4. (comment repeated for 7.E.2-7.E.4)
- Unnecessary building to maintain. Control from vehicle
- On a busy summer day traffic will back up to South Nags Head & Pea Island. On top of that the area does self regulate and folks who feel crowded will leave.
- There is no documentation that crowding is having a significant, adverse impact on visitor satisfaction. Limiting use in some areas may, in fact, have a negative impact on user satisfaction. See additional comments for section 5. In the absence of any documented need for establishing a carrying capacity, this alternative represents an incredible waste of scarce resources. (comment repeated for 7.E.2 – 7.E.4)
- Year round? What would the staff do on the 320 days out of the year when their presence would be unwarranted?
- Creating line on Highway 12 is not a good idea. NPS does not have the resources or staff today. This would be a public relations nightmare
- Let free access determine carrying capacity rather than establish a capacity limit. Enforcement personnel could better regulate on an incident to incident protocol if circumstances deemed some sort of controls were necessary.
- More patrols by enforcement and other park personnel in “enforcement” colored vehicles would make the need for this requirement to be of no use. NCBBA and CHAC have offered in the past and been refused the establishment of a citizens patrol to rove these area without confrontation but for reporting to on duty rangers needed enforcement. (comment repeated for 7.E.2-7.E.4)

**7.E.2** If the entrance is for capacity control, access from Ramp 2 (or the alternate Ramp 2.5 in option A) would be controlled/closed.

**May Be Effective**

- seasonal

**Not Effective**

- Artificial limits not needed
- No cap.
- Cost prohibitive, safety issues could arise by stopping them on Highway 12 for processing through an collection site. Better enforcement presence would work better.
- Not needed. Instead put some money into enforcement. Abusive users & poor driving flourishes because of lack of enforcement.

**7.E.3** Charge an ORV entrance fee at Ramp 4 year-round, to pay for the entrance station staff.

**Definitely Effective**

- Commensurate to the cost of ORV management.

**May Be Effective**

- May be effective to pay for it if it's put there, not to meet any other objective.

#### **Not Effective**

- Permitting is a better way to go.
- Artificial limits not needed
- sticker fee should cover cost of management
- charge for a permit only
- Decision should not be fee driven
- Cost prohibitive, safety issues could arise by stopping them on Highway 12 for processing through an collection site. Better enforcement presence would work better.
- If permit system is not in place, no fee should be charged to access any beach.
- If entrance fee is charged let government pay for staff. Use fees for maintenance.
- Not workable without complete redesign of the intersection with rt12. Traffic backups will be huge. Calm humans will congregate closer together, get rowdy & they spread apart.
- In one instance they raise the specter of a fee permit system and already here is a concept of a sub fee for a particular part of the seashore. His is neither fair nor practicable.
- The ORV permit fee is enough.
- If ORV's pay a fee, then pedestrians should also. Safety issue with traffic backing up on Rt. 12 & Bonner Bridge.
- The only type fee should be levied on all people whther they are ORV users or not and it should be done at the main entrance. User fees to access ramps and for permits are not practical because the park is so large.

**7.E.4** Establish an ORV carrying capacity from Ramp 4 to the spit and enforce the capacity on a first come/first serve basis or by issuing permits for the area.

#### **May Be Effective**

- overall permit system would be preferable
- If effective control is established, but dislike first come first serve basis excluding some from further distances.

#### **Not Effective**

- Cost prohibitive, safety issues could arise by stopping them on Highway 12 for processing through an collection site. Better enforcement presence would work better.
- This is one of the most popular tourist beaches because of it's proximity to the northern island villages
- You kill our local economy for day trippers and punish local residents
- This would deny use by folks who just want to drive out to the inlet, or the point just to do it. There is no reason for somebody to have a reason to do anything, as long as it doesn't harm another.

- The carrying capacity question keeps coming up and I argue that capacity would be a self limiting procedure. Excess SUVs may access the area but if they find no place to park they will leave and find some other place to go. Enforcement personnel could keep them moving or get them turned around.

## **7.F. Provide Soundside Access**

**7.F.1** Open the existing road behind the lighthouse to ORV use and designate a parking capacity to provide for kayaking and canoeing in this area to address the limited soundside access on Bodie Island.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Yes this would relieve pressure at ramp 4
- Yes a place for folks to go. Destinations are a very good thing.
- Over the years significant amounts of sound side access have been lost. Opening an existing road will minimize resource use while contributing to visitor use and experience.
- off island slough is very tough to get to
- A small boat ramp should also be added within this option.

### **Not Effective**

- leave it as is

**7.F.2** Provide better access to “Kite Point” (i.e., Salvo day use area) for ORVs.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Over the years significant amounts of sound side access have been lost. Improvements to existing facilities will minimize resource use while contributing to visitor use and experience.
- A small boat ramp should also be added within this option.
- I like all of the natural vegetation (i.e. Cedar Trees) don't cut this down.

### **Not Effective**

- Areas like sound shore are too fragile for ORVs and doesn't allow for natural processes.

**7.F.3** Identify and establish other soundside access points and parking areas.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Identify yes establish no
- There are several areas south of Salvo where this would work.
- So long as there are no additional structures, just access and parking. No bathhouses, port-a-johns, etc.
- Develop better boat ramps such as Rodanthe (helicopter pad/recycling area) and Avon for launching boats into the sound.
- A small boat ramp should also be added within this option.

## **Not Effective**

- Sound areas need to be left intact. They are the most pristine/wild intact areas left in the park.

## **7.G. Provide ORV Access Seasonally**

**7.G.1** Establish passive recreation area in front of Avon, Frisco, and Salvo during the summer, open to ORV use other times of the year – located in both the Bodie and Hatteras Ranger Districts. (*status quo*)

### **Definitely Effective**

- I like this. Its seams fair. In October and November I never felt I was intruding with someone's time on the beach. In August I never felt like I need to be in front of beach houses.
- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15. This applies to all villages and seasonally closed areas.

### **May Be Effective**

- Passive Recreation is a very misleading term - see note at end. Would be effective if you include Rodanthe and Waves.

### **Not Effective**

- Limits access to beach front properties.
- ORV access should be banned in village beach areas year-round.
- Village areas should be year round passive areas. Work with the county and landowners to provide access and parking to these areas.

**7.G.2** Continue the seasonal ORV closure from Ramp 1, south of Ramp 2 consistent with the seasonal ORV closure dates in front of the villages.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Then open them off season.

### **May Be Effective**

- Open Ramp 2 in the summertime. Expansion of ramp 1 is necessary to allow this. Opening of Ramp 2 reduces pressure at ramp 4 both to the North and South.

### **Not Effective**

- not needed due to low pedestrian usage
- The map indicates that Ramp 1 to Ramp 2 is a seasonally closed areas. This seasonal closure provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15.
- Make those areas year round passive areas.
- This should be open to ORV use year around when beach is wide enough for safe passage at low tide. There is a reason for all ramps now having a sign that says something like "Beach may be impassable at high tide".

**7.G.3** Open the entire beach on Bodie Island (i.e., Ramp 1 to Oregon Inlet) to ORV use during the winter time.

**Definitely Effective**

- As per the map, this is the status quo. The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15. This applies to all villages and seasonally closed areas.

**May Be Effective**

- I'm not familiar with what this beach looks like. How wide is this. Seems to me that highway 12 washes over in spots. How safe would beach access be in those areas. Maybe portions would be OK, but I just don't know.

**Not Effective**

- Does not appear to consider winter habitat requirements
- Do away with seasonal and non-seasonal closures/openings.

**7.H. Provide Larger Parking Lots in the Tri-village Area and Establish Passive Recreation Areas**

**7.H.1** Increase parking at Ramp 23. Area north of the parking lot would be a passive recreation area and ORV use would be permitted in the area south of the ramp.

**Definitely Effective**

- In season. The off season goes back to ORV use. More parking, toilets & showers should be installed and some of the crowd from Coquina beach could use this new area.

**May Be Effective**

- Seasonal limitation as stated with full ORV access in winter
- Only if done during the summer season
- would impact vegetation building a larger parking lot
- Only if it is done seasonally. Ramp 23 should remain open to the north during the off season.
- if passive area is only in the on season

**Not Effective**

- It is not clear to the extent of ORV use nor how it may impact on pedestrian passive recreation, or ORV impact on resources.
- ORV corridor 5 to go north or move the passive area .05 mile south of Tri-village area with multiple access points.
- I SUPPORT INCREASING THE PARKING AREA BUT DO NOT SUPPORT A PASSIVE AREA DUE TO A LACK OF WALK-OVERS IN PAST YEARS.
- No reason to prohibit ORVs north of 23 except in front of Avon in season.

- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15. Expansion of year round passive recreation closures to the north of ramp 23 are not required and serve one purpose only--to limit off-season access to otherwise deserted beaches. See pictures attached "Additional Comments\_off season use". With respect to increased parking, if observed usage indicates this is needed by all means do it.
- Passive area north of ramp 23 should remain as is. This is approximately three quarter of a mile north of ramp 23
- The parking lot at ramp 23 is currently underutilized.
- Tri-village area has Pea Island Refuge as close to the north as Ramp 23 is to the south with many miles of passive use. Partner with USFW to make more parking accesses within this area for passive use.
- Passive Recreation is a very misleading term - see note at end. Increased parking is a good idea. However, the concept of passive recreation on the north side is not needed as only a few visitors object to ORV's and they have the option of using the beaches in front of the villages and even walking for an added 13 miles up to Oregon Inlet and back if they don't want to see ORVs. The concept of single use beaches only adds problems for management of the seashore.
- Still doesn't solve the access issue in the closed area. Make the state open an access area in the village which was closed to ORV use
- This would encourage transient use of the beach by those not staying on the island.

**7.H.2** Add parking and a boardwalk between Ramps 23 and 27, with pedestrian access only on these ramps.

**Definitely Effective**

- More access is needed for everybody. The more access points the less over crowding

**May Be Effective**

- Expansion of pedestrian access separate from vehicles would appear favorable.

**Not Effective**

- 4 miles between ramps is sufficient. More parking and more cuts in the dunes impacts vegetation
- Pedestrian access only is not effective in these areas and is not needed.
- Ped access only on 23 and 27? No to that—ped access only on proposed boardwalk? Fine
- You don't currently have sufficient ramps for ORV's between Salvo and Avon, especially when closures are activated.
- Pedestrian north of ramp 23 in season ORV south in season. ORV everywhere off season.
- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15. Expansion of year round passive recreation closures to the north of ramp 23 are not required and serve one purpose only--to limit off-season access to otherwise deserted beaches. See pictures attached "Additional Comments\_off season use". With respect to increased parking, if observed usage indicates this is needed by all means do it.
- With no orv access – never. Okay with orv access.

- The added boardwalk must be handicap accessible. An added ramp needs to be placed midway between Ramps 23 and 27 in addition to an interdunal road running between Ramp 23 and Ramp 34.

**7.H.3** Provide restroom and/or bathhouse facilities at Ramps 23 and/or 27.

**Definitely Effective**

- I would think it would help with the over crowding at Oregon Inlet.
- Do this at ramp 23, the day use area bathroom could be tied together for one sewage system instead of 2.

**May Be Effective**

- Must be maintained on a daily bases.
- Only one is necessary during the off season. Both during the summer season. This will help relieve pressure at ramp 4 during the summer. Bath house similar to Coquina beach would be great at one of these locations.
- could provide another 'popular' area
- Between 23 – 27 and between ramp 30 and 34
- Especially Ramp 23
- If observed usage indicates that an expansion of facilities is warranted by all means do it.
- We have survived well enough without these amenities for generations; however if you partner with the Outer Banks Tourism Board for grants they will be nice, but not needed as a part of this ruling process.
- 23 has facilities across the highway. Adding same @ 27 may help disperse the visitors.

**Not Effective**

- A bathhouse at ramp 23 is not needed. There is already a bathhouse at the salvo day Use area across the road
- No additional structures. No septic tanks. No wells.
- Restrooms and dumpsters must be added at all ramps.

**7.H.4** Close to ORV use from Ramp 23 to one mile north of Ramp 27 year-round; expanding the parking lot at Ramp 23 and create a passive recreation area (this area is not a high ORV use area and the number of cottages is expanding).

**Definitely Effective**

- This is a narrow beach area that experiences frequent safety closures.

**May Be Effective**

- Seasonal closure may be appropriate
- this may be a potential compromise

**Not Effective**

- there are no cottages between 23 and 27??

- May not be very high use ORV area but it cut's down on winter access during the fishing season.
- ORV uses from Rodanthe, Waves and Salvo use this area frequently. It is a major attraction to the rental homes in this area. Closure of these key ramps would cause more over crowding in other areas especially during the peak season. Opening the ramp at 20 in season and perhaps all year would be very beneficial and would help solve this issue. Opening 20 and building a ramp, parking lot with rest rooms at 25 would also benefit this area. Both of these ideas would ease Medical emergency access to this congested area. As well.
- Eventually you will run out of beach with this mentality
- This area is currently used by ORVs. Less access would only serve to increase crowding at other areas.
- I believe this area is a high use ORV section and have seen it on many occasions
- Believe this ramp is used quite often
- You currently have 6 miles of beach in front of the cottages in Rodanthe, Waves, and Salvo. ORV use in ramps 23-27 are used extensively by Nags Head, KDH and Kitty Hawk personnel.
- No reason to prohibit ORVs from this area.
- This would create too large of a Passive use area. It would then be underutilized, and taking valuable ORV beach away from the ORV folks.
- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15. Expansion of year round passive recreation closures to the north of ramp 23 are not required and serve one purpose only--to limit off-season access to otherwise deserted beaches. See pictures attached "Additional Comments\_off season use". With respect to increased parking, if observed usage indicates this is needed by all means do it. With respect to the premise that the number of cottages in the RSW area is expanding, they cannot possibly expand beyond the current village boundary which ends north of ramp 23--that is, the premise for this alternative is flawed.
- In salvo the houses have expanded as far south to the NP boundary. Ramp 23 **“IS A HIGH ORV USE AREA”** Ramp 23 is the first ramp south of Oragin Inlet and many visitors coming from the north use ramp 23 and the beach. North of ramp 23 to the wreck is a very popular fishing area. **THIS BEACH SHOULD NOT BE CLOSED**
- Cottages are not expanding South of 23, in fact the Salvo line is about a mile North of 23
- Will only increase crowding elsewhere and is discriminatory to users from Rodanthe, Waves, and Salvo
- This will start the process of placing more ORV's in smaller and smaller areas. ORV use for access is also increasing. The problem is that there is little parking space in any of the villages for people who are not renting ocean front property. Many visitors realize this and have ORV's in order to access the beaches. Cost of ocean front property for parking is out of the question. I would guess that more visitors recreating on park land outside of the villages get there by ORV than by way of parking in lots and walking to the beach. If this is ture, more ORV space is needed rather than less.
- Not a heavy ORV use area? On Sunday of Memorial Day Weekend 2007 from Ramp 23 for 1 mile south I counted 213 vehicles at 2:00 P.M.
- Ramp 23 closure is unacceptable and ORV users from the villages use this area heavily, closure would cause other areas of crowding during peak season. Opening ramp 20 seasonally and possibly year round would ease crowding and offer Medical personnel additional access in this area a major commitment would be necessary to accommodate large numbers of people their families pets ishing equipment, shelter, food, water, ect.

- Ramp 23 is heavily utilized by the visitors and residents of Waves, Rodanthe and Salvo. Closure would cause overcrowding at other ramps. Ramp 20 in Rodanthe could be opened to help relieve an already congested ramp and allow medical emergency vehicles easier access.
- The evidence, documented most recently by the NPS report for the 2007 season, does not indicate ORV's are responsible for bird or turtle nest failures. Existing NPS procedures are largely effective in preventing ORV damage to nests. Better signage, more visible at night, would make the current procedures even more effective by preventing ORV driving below the high tide line at nest closures. (Many drivers drive below the high tide line to take advantage of the hard packed sand and may not see signs if they are not very close to this area.) This is not an ORV issue therefore. Predators, as well as the violence of storms, are the primary nest failure culprits. Many of the suggestions in this document fail to recognize this important point and attempt to put an undue burden on the ORV user. The NPS should look for ways to make the current bird and turtle nesting activity more successful before it proposes expensive management programs that may be just as unsuccessful. Predator controls should be enhanced, as long as, in the process, new endangered species are not created. The NPS should also give strong consideration to turtle nest relocation as a standard. As mentioned above, the 2007 report confirms that ORV's did not significantly impact 2007 nesting activity, yet success rates were marginal. Temporary beach closures were an inconvenience, but not outrageous. However, turtle nest relocation and management would ensure that the maximum possible success rate occurs.
- I don't pretend to be a scientist, but the trend data on plover nestings over the last twenty years must call into question the viability of the CHNRS as a nesting area. One must wonder if global warming has changed the area sufficiently that plovers no longer favor the area for breeding activity. I don't advocate using financial resources to confirm this possibility. I do believe a moderate level of common sense must be used in the management of this resource.
- Passive recreation can take place on all of Pea Island. Why close more beach to ORV use? It is not high ORV use but closing it will force ORVs to go to other areas that may become high because more beach was closed. This is one of the best sections of the island for ORV use. Ramp 23 is used by most people staying at the TRI-Village. Closing this ramp will force everyone to use Ramp 27 causing unnecessary overcrowding. I can not imagine it being closed. The number of "cottages expanding" should not be a reason for year round closure!! There is a lot of money going into those houses. Are the owners going to be given their own private beach too!! The area north of Ramp 23 is protected for passive recreation on a seasonal basis. That takes care of growing use by "expanding number of cottages." If this section is closed, open same number of miles north of Rodanthe to make up for the loss? Bottom line--there is already passive recreation within this area--that is North of Rodanthe. Which reminds me, Ramp 20 was closed years ago due to weather. Consideration should be give to re-open this ramp for seasonal use.

## **7.I. Alternative Transportation**

**7.I.1** Establish alternative transportation systems in areas with sensitive resources, such as Bodie Island Spit to provide access when the spit is otherwise inaccessible by ORVs or by foot, such as could happen during breeding season.

### **May Be Effective**

- Costly and capacity limited
- all depends on "alternative" transportation method.
- This would be a major commitment and the cost may be prohibitive. The logistics would not be easy because of the gear the visitors would want to bring.
- could be quickly overwhelmed during peak usage periods
- Maintain closures in accordance with ESA and discontinue setting aside land for birds that "might" come here. Most users respect the closures and again, increased LEO presence is the key

- Restrict all non-official access during breeding season.
- Possibly would work but I think more concentration on ways and means of bypassing breeding areas would be more effective

### **Not Effective**

- Access restrictions need to be applied equitably to all user groups. Utilize management strategies based on proven science and consistent application throughout the region.
- As stated in 1.I. 5. There is no way to make this work.
- Available of transportation equipment and maintenance of the equipment would be cost prohibited. Transportation would need a schedule. Drivers would need to be trained because of liabilities. Liability insurance would be needed.
- Not cost effective and due to high volume use by ORV users. Users also bring rods, reels, coolers. Umbrellas, kiteboards, surf boards etc. making this impossible. Again you create major portions of the beach or sound side closed that are highly used by recreational visitors and in a highly washover area. Instead why don't you partner with Corp. of Engineer and other entities to provide more and larger dredge spoil islands in the sound that can be created, maintained and closed to public as resting and breeding areas for this wild life. The area of Cape Hatteras Seashore is a shoulder area for both nesting and wintering plovers and be at the edge of their habitat makes it a poor choice for the high cost of trying to increase their population here. Instead you can take Portsmouth Island who only sees a small percentage of visitors compared to this recreational seashore to do these closures. Portsmouth has little dune structure and many better areas to promote nest and wintering habitats. Also in the vegetated portion of this area that have become unfit for breeding habitat open portions of them each winter to ORV and encourage use of the vegetated area opened to expand the habitat needed for breeding the next season. (comment repeated for 7.I.2 and 7.J.1)
- Bodie Island is not accessible by foot to anyone with a family or who intends to do anything that requires more than just a towel. Even if they do walk to the spit the ocean becomes their bathroom as it is too far to walk back to the port-a-potties. Any kind of alternative transportation system would be far too expensive and unreliable. We must not forget that Congress created this Park as a recreation area first. Past management practices at spits and the point have been the major cause of loss of habitat and caused the problems we have today. Eliminating the vegetation at these popular recreation and breeding areas with natural barriers (vegetated dunes) to separate birds and users is the only answer.

### **(No Selection)**

- may be effective if the closures are for nesting birds, not reservations that might not be made.

**7.I.2** Increase parking at the Oregon Inlet fishing center and establish a water taxi/shuttle service that would operate under a Commercial Use Authorization to transport visitors to the spit at Oregon Inlet when it is otherwise inaccessible by land.

### **May Be Effective**

- As long as this shuttle isn't forced upon every user. Reading between the lines on this one, approval could mean completely limiting ORV use.
- able to carry tackle and equipment
- would have limited feasibility due to weather and capacity considerations.
- Possibly slightly effective but I can't conceive of a water taxi accommodating the hordes of people who are there around Independence day.

## **Not Effective**

- Costly and capacity limited
- Fishermen would be overrun by bathers.
- If it is inaccessible by land either there is a resource closure or it is unsafe to be there and therefore there should be no access by any user group.
- Not practical due to weather tides and the dangerous nature of the inlet.
- The government wants to close these areas to ORV's on one hand but make it accessible to pedestrian foot-traffic, on the other hand. Pedestrians cause more harm to vegetation and wildlife than ORV's which travel low tide areas.
- This also is unworkable. An inner dunal trail could be cut behind the dune line to the spit. The equipment used to construct the trail could then be used to clear the grasses & weeds overgrowing the bird nesting areas.
- This is not feasible – any water taxi would not be able to handle the large number of visitors and their equipment. Visitors could be stranded in case of an emergency. Would need a dock at the spit. Liability problems could occur.
- Ban access when area is naturally inaccessible.
- This would be costly and unreliable and does not deal with the problem only creates another. Past management practices at spits and the point have been the major cause of loss of habitat and caused the problems we have today. Eliminating the vegetation at these popular recreation and breeding areas and create natural barriers (vegetated dunes) to separate birds and people is the only answer.

## **7.J. Increase ORV Access Whenever Resource Closures Occur**

**7.J.1** Increase ORV access elsewhere when there are resource closures at popular areas such as the spits and Cape Point. For example, increase ORV access north of Ramp 4 to some extent if/when resource closures at the spit reduce the amount of area open to ORV use. This is most applicable to the summer season when both resource use of habitat and Seashore visitation are high.

## **Definitely Effective**

- Only if current efforts on protected species can prove need to continue limitations. At this point, no Cost benefit analysis of current efforts has been provided to prove success. All efforts should be expanded to open access.
- Maintain closures in accordance with the ESA and discontinue the reservation system for the birds that might come. The “build it and they will come” approach is absurd. Most visitors respect the closures. Enforcement visibility at closures will insure that all will respect the closures
- See that didn't hurt at all. But it's not with just this. The vegetation has to be cleared to free up the interior for the birds to rest & nest. This has been delayed for much too long.
- Given the dynamic nature of CHNSRA's beaches, access options will always be unpredictable. The only way to provide adequate access for all types of users is to allow the NPS to respond to the changing environment by adjusting boundaries when needed because of extensive safety or resource closures. In no case should lifeguarded beaches be opened to ORV use

## **May Be Effective**

- I am not in favor of complete closures so this question is a moot point...

- Summer only
- I think this might be an alternative when demand is high for beach access.
- Don't take a 'build and the will come' approach to management approach. Most visitors respect closures and more enforcement will insure that all will respect them.
- The closures must be maintained in accordance with the ESA and discontinued the practice for birds that might come. Again the checkerboard rotations is the best plan. Most visitors respect the closure and better enforcement with a zero tolerance approach would fix it.
- resource closures should not be increased if this policy is put in effect. This should not be a way to shuffle ORV users to open additional areas for protected species
- Not until T/E species breeding, foraging, and germination have reached a sustainable recovery level.
- This is only a stop gap concept. The long term solution is to eliminate the vegetation at these popular recreation and breeding areas and create natural barriers (vegetated dunes) to separate birds and people.

#### **Not Effective**

- Cape Point should remain open year round. When beach users are being shut out of other areas of their Park because of resource closures. Ramp 43 to Cape Point should remain open for the public.
- Expanded ORV use would appear to negative impact on resources. Resource and pedestrian sensitive ORV ceilings should be established and effectively monitored and enforced.
- Where else is there to open without encroaching on passive recreation areas?
- If these areas can be periodically available for ORV access, they should be open all the time.
- The point is the place for fishing ,you close this the fisherman will not go anywhere else except some other place outside of the obx. The point is a must to keep open to orv use. Close this and you shut down the obx. I know I won't be around

#### **Additional comments Bodie Island Ranger District management options:**

- All efforts toward a permit system should be immediately voided as this would be a waste of federal cash resources. A permit system is limited access and is not acceptable.
- I have not even tried to evaluate these site specific options. I simply have no personal knowledge on which to base opinions and no data are provided to give each option a context. As matter of principle I do not think it is wise to open any new areas to ORV use—such as is suggested in option 7.J.1 above. It will be very difficult to police and once in it will be almost impossible to get the ORVs back out.
- The Bodie Island district has the highest concentration of visitors per square mile in the entire park. Two enforcement officers are assigned to cover these 27+ miles of beach in the peak season. We don't need additional rules, permits, carrying capacity limits. Rather, we need more enforcement of existing rules and regulations. Keeping the spit closed has allowed brush and grasses to cover large areas formerly considered prime habitat for shorebirds. Due to mismanagement, they are now forced into areas occupied by humans as similarly as the alligators of the Everglades, the bears in Yellowstone and the elk in Glacier National Parks among others. Restoration of this sand spit will help restore the bird population

- To have more access to beaches would be nice from my point of view. But at the same time it is nice to dive through areas like Bodie Island and Pea Island on my way to beach access knowing that there are places set aside. This makes my argument that much more poignant. Don't take away ORV
- The Bodie Island district has the highest concentration of visitors per square mile in the entire park. There are only 2 enforcement officers assigned to cover 27+ miles of beach during the season. We don't need different rules, permits, carrying capacity limits. We just need more enforcement presence of the existing rules and regulations. Keeping the OI spit closed this long has dramatically changed the vegetation and habit for the very birds we are trying to attract. Due to mismanagement (wide-scale closure at OI spit) the birds are now forced (attracted due to habitat) to encroach on the habitat where the most visitor use is reserved. Restoration of this sand spit to the life long practice will be a good first step to improve this situation. Keeping the spit closed has allowed brush and vegetation to grow that is actually shrinking the bird habitat. Alternatives need to be explored where checkerboard rotations will help improve this. The checkerboard rotations are only for active nesting's. Furthermore a well thought and planned development of the Ramp 1, 2, 4, and 20, 23, 27 areas will create immediate value and help spread the congestion out along the entire resource. A new ramp access at 25 would help even further. This final construction plan could be phased in over several years to help with costs and budgets. If ramp 1 is expanded with a bath house and parking this would be good. But even better if a Coquina style bath area was made at 23, 25 or 27 even better. The key is to have a well designed plan and then spread the construction costs to the out years.
- The sole ORV violation I have witnessed was on the Bodie Is. spit. It is not unusual for hours to pass without seeing a Ranger. Additional personnel assignments should be made for this area. Increase bird population by restoring some of the areas that have grown up.
- New rules and regulations are not the answer. Enforce the rules and regulation that are in place. NPS needs additional resources to enforce the rules and regulations. New ones will not help the situation.
- Re examine the possibility of opening some of the beach area from Oregon inlet south to Rodanthe to ORVs
- More law enforcement is required in this area as it is the most visited.
- Bodie Island beaches are one of the most popular beach areas in the Park. Don't believe permits are required if law enforcement is increased and enforced.
- The status quo is adequate as it stands in this area
- The Bodie Island district has the highest concentration of visitors per square mile in the entire Park. Two enforcement officers are assigned to cover these 27 + miles of beach in the peak season. Additional rules, regulations, permits, carrying capacity limits are not required. What is needed is more enforcement of the rules and regulations already on the books. I believe it is appropriate to remind everyone of the "KISS" method. Keeping the spit closed has allowed brush and grasses to cover large areas formerly considered prime habitat for shorebirds. Due to mismanagement they are now forced into areas occupied by humans. Restoration of this sand spit will help restore the bird populations.
- As stated before, increased enforcement would make more restrictive closures unnecessary.
- Keeping the spit closed has allowed brush and grasses to cover large areas formerly considered prime habitat for shorebirds. Due to mismanagement they are now forced into areas occupied by humans as similarly as the alligators of the Everglades, the bears in Yellowstone and the elk in GlacieNational Parks among others.
- I can hear some of the arguments between a couple, if they are prevented from driving out to the spit, because they are not staying out there utilizing the resource by fishing, picnicking, birding etc. "Honey I told you we didn't need to drive this gas hog down here to the beach, they won't even let you go on the beach, just for a little bit. You stubborn fool you." As has been demonstrated by past performance, doing nothing, does not work. We have to become proactive to get the best uses out of this Park. Clearing the interior of this spit will provide additional feeding, nesting, resting areas for all the shore line birds. By creating small interior puddles, even a tire track that fills with stagnant water, life will develop. Taking down the fences in the fall & winter will allow ORVs to help keep this area free of most regrowth. It will also cause additional tracks that will form pools of life for the non-fledged chicks to

feed. Open ramp 1 & 2 off season. There is not enough passive recreation in the fall & winter & spring not to. Keep the entrance of the ramps filled with soft sand. This will prevent folks who don't know what they are doing, from getting to the tide line & into more serious trouble.

- The map which accompanies this workbook indicates that ramp 1 to ramp 2 and the village beaches in front of RSW are seasonally closed. All these areas are listed as open off season. This arrangement is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003. With respect to seasonal closures there may be some basis for extending them from May 1 to October 15. Furthermore, the concept of adaptive management used in the interim plan should be applied to the boundaries of seasonal closures when extensive resource and safety closures are required. Above and beyond the above changes, park resources would be most effective if directed at maintenance, improvements to existing facilities, provisions for alternate routes, and expanded sound side access. Additionally, resources should be directed toward enforcement of existing rules--that is, its not broke don't fix it.
- This is one area of the National Seashore I do not visit frequently and feel my input would not be based on personal experiences or real knowledge. This is something that I feel should be used in these evaluations, people who know, understand, and visit the area. Not a group of people who have never even been to the area. This is a very unique place, and there is no way that someone who has never been here, or has on limited occasions, can make a fair and accurate assessment.
- Passive recreation should be expanded and encouraged in this district. ORV access should be discouraged, limited and subject to user permit fees. The sight of Ramp 3 and Bodie Island Spit during the summer season is an embarrassment to any respectable park. It is among the worst management practices allowed in any national park within the National Park system.
- Since in the Pea Island Refuge NPS owns the ocean side from the mean high tide line to the water and the sound side from 150 ft inland from the mean high tide line to the water, the Pea Island Refuge area should be considered for developing added passive activity areas with added/replacement parking and walkways that have been lost over the years. USFWS contends that ORV use in the Pea Island Refuge is not consistent with their mandate for refuge use in general; yet the same USFWS manager allows such use in the Currituck Refuge. Pea Island Refuge should certainly be considered as a passive activity offset use to prevent further ORV use restrictions for passive activities. It should further be considered for ORV use if ORVs must be further restricted in other areas of the Seashore. Habitat restoration (eg raking out the vegetation as was done in the past) needs to be done on the Spit. Restriction of ORVs has allowed vegetation to expand, thus reducing habitat. Because of the loss of Ramp 20, serious consideration needs to be given to a new Ramp to take its place. True the beach at the North end of Rodanthe is at present narrow, but that may not be true as time progresses. It may eventually be possible to open a Ramp somewhere just North of Rodanthe in Pea Island.
- Passive areas should not change or be dictated by resource closed ORV areas, doing so will create additional user conflicts. Permanent year round passive areas should be established. Design and implement one entrance and exit ramp for this area. Do away with seasonal and non-seasonal designations. Institute a shuttle service. Do not build new interdunal roads. Establish realistic esthetic enforceable carrying capacities.
- This area definitely has too few enforcement rangers for such a geographically large and highly used area. Carrying capacity keeps coming up in discussion but any decision regarding such must of necessity be arbitrary and subjective. Over a 48 year period I have witnessed the proliferation of people and orvs at Cape Hatteras but as annoying as it is to one who has witnessed the good old days it has proved to be a self regulating situation. I don't go to Cape Point very often and particularly not on weekends and holidays as it is too crowded and I am not alone in this. I don't want to head to Cape Point on a hot summer day to find a long line of people waiting to get on. What a waste of time, effort, and fuel. Currently I can go, get in a long line of slowly moving traffic, travel to the point, see there is no place to park or access the beach, then turn around and go somewhere else. But my actions are my own, and I am self regulating the load on the beach by leaving it. This is not government's function to make that decision for me. What if I just wanted to take a ride and not fish or go to the water? A carrying capacity limit would preclude even a ride on the beach..

- Beach driving is a must and specially the point year around. Nothing else matters, just manage all resources so this happens. Freedom that is what America is about.
- ALL IMPROVEMENTS TO MAKE VISITS MORE COMFORTABLE, SUCH AS RESTROOMS AND AIR STATIONS, ARE APPRECIATED, BUT LET'S NOT IMPROVE IT TO THE EXTENT THAT IT IS NO LONGER A WILDERNESS INSTEAD OF A CITY PARK.
- I can hear some of the arguments between a tourist couple, if they are prevented from driving out to the spit because they are not staying out there utilizing the resource by fishing, picnicking, birding etc. "Honey I told you we didn't need to drive this gas hog ORV down here to the beach, they won't even let you go on the beach, just for a little bit. You stubborn fool you." (no better way to spoil a vacation). As has been demonstrated by past performance, doing nothing, does not work. We have to become proactive to get the best uses out of this Park. Clearing the interior of this spit will provide additional feeding, nesting, resting areas for all the shore line birds. By creating small interior puddles, even a tire track that fills with stagnant water, life will develop. Taking down the fences in the fall & winter will allow ORVs to help keep this area free of most regrowth. It will also cause additional tracks that will form pools of life for the non-fledged chicks to feed. Open ramp 1 & 2 off season. There is not enough passive recreation users in the fall, winter and spring to keep these ramps closed. Keep the entrance of the ramps filled with soft sand. This will prevent folks who don't know what they are doing, from getting to the tide line and into more serious trouble. The Bodie Island district has the highest concentration of visitors per square mile in the entire Park. Only two Enforcement Officers are assigned to cover these 27+ miles of beach in the peak season. We don't need additional rules, permits, carrying capacity limits, we need more enforcement of the existing rules and regulations that are on the books. Keeping the spit closed has allowed brush and grasses to cover large areas formerly considered prime habitat for shorebirds. Due to mismanagement or shortsightedness, they are now forced into areas occupied by humans. Restoration of this sand spit will help restore the bird population and keep other users of this area happy.
- The Bodie Island district has the highest concentration of re mile in the entire Park. 2 Enforcement Officers are assigned to cover 27+ miles of beach in the peak season. We don't need more rules, permits, fees or carrying capacity limits. We need more enforcement of existing rules and regulations. Keeping the spit closed has allowed brush and grasses to cover large areas formerly considered prime habitat for shorebirds. Due to mismanagement they are now forced into areas occupied by humans as similarly as the alligators of the Everglades, the bears in Yellowstone and the elk in Glacier National Parks among others. Restoration of this sand spit would help restore the bird population.
- We don't need more rules, permit and regulation. Better enforcement of existing regulations would be a better choice. Have more park rangers to patrol this area of high use.
- 7.H.4. You are totally wrong about ramp 23, "area is not a high ORV use area". On most occasions when I have used this ramp vehicles are highly concentrated approximately half way to ramp 27 (2 miles) this statement makes me doubt the credibility of this study! Any available fund for new construction for pedestrian access should be spent on Pea Island where vehicular traffic is prohibited.
- The greater amount or difficulties occur at Bodie Is. Spit and Oregon Inlet when an inappropriate amount of land us closed for resource protection Pea Island is immediately south of Oregon Inlet and could / does handle endangered species requirements.
- To examine on a site specific basis has targeted the most popular ORV use areas, with a list of reasons to close, restrict, limit, charge for and deny access to ORV users. Any area can host flora and fauna, steps, then, when these occur, meet and treat them with protocols. This policy would ensure species protection and continue to afford maximum ORV access/usage! By continue to over-protocol for flora/ fauna that might visit has a horrible financial effect on the cities and 7 villages that adjoin the park. Several years ago a very flawed and skewed questions was taken by a group headed by a Mr. Vogel song (sp?). Only selected people were asked to participate and out of towners were targeted who where her on vacation. Locals, business owners, local government-all were all but omitted from input, and the results of the study should not be used in any formulation of a plan that contains reductions in access that MR. Vs survey said would not financially greatly impact the entire outer banks business community. Open beaches built in this area, and closing them will ruin the area-costing job loss, business failures, financial chaos for [indecipherable].
- Do not frequent Bodie Island much but, think better access to Oregon Inlet Beach is necessary.

- Imagine: A ranger jumps on @ 34, heads north and leaves the beach at 27!
- More rangers, as per park service regulations, would solve most of the problems that occur inside the park. Less time patrolling HWY 12 and more time on the beach, is one way to increase ranger presence at the park.
- The Bodie Island district has the highest concentration of visitors per square mile in the entire Park. 2 Enforcement Officers are assigned to cover these 27+ miles of beach in the park season. We don't need additional rules, permits, carrying capacity limits. We need more enforcement of existing rules and regulations.
- New ramp not necessary. Ramp 1 to Coquina Bush closed only when lifeguards present in season. Year-round closure of passive recreation are not effective and unfair to all users. Additional parking at Ramp 2 to the north is needed for bath house. Bodie Island Spit – allow ORV use from Ramp 4 to Oregon Inlet year round Restoration to excessive closures should be done to benefit breeding birds. Ramp 4 needs additional parking. Interdunal road from Ramp 4 to spit, during closures, good idea. Boardwalk not practical due to distance that would be involved. Provide ORV corridor from Ramp 1 to the inlet, during the winter, is a good idea. No capacity control or limiting of number on beach should be employed. All soundside access ideas are good. Seasonal access = Avon, Frisco, Salvo maintain status quo and open Bodie island during winter. Pedestrian access only on ramps is not a good idea. Bathhouse at 27 may help crowding at Oregon Inlet. Ramp 23 closure is a very bad idea. ORV in tri-village area use it a lot.
- The Bodie Island district has the highest concentration of visitors per square mile in the entire Park. 2 Enforcement Officers are assigned to cover these 27 + miles of beach in the peak season. We don't need additional rules, permits, carrying capacity limits we need more enforcement of existing rules and regulations.
- Keeping the spit closed has allowed brush and grasses to cover large areas formerly considered prime habitat for shorebirds. Due to mismanagement they are now forced into areas occupied by humans as similarly as the alligators of the Everglades, the bears in Yellowstone and the elk in Glacier National Parks among others. Restoration of this sand spit will help restore the bird population.
- Bodie Island has high visitor activity per square mile. Enforcement of existing rules and regulations would provide most benefit to the park use. Keeping spit closed has caused brush and grass to cover areas formerly considered prime habitat for shorebirds. Restoration of sand spit would help restore bird population.
- The map which accompanies this workbook indicates that ramp 1 to ramp 2 and the village beaches in front of RSW are seasonally closed. All these areas are listed as open off season. This arrangement is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003.
- With respect to seasonal closures there may be some basis for extending them from May 1 to October 15. Furthermore, the concept of adaptive management used in the interim plan should be applied to the boundaries of seasonal closures when extensive resource and safety closures are required.
- Above and beyond the above changes, park resources would be most effective if directed at maintenance, improvements to existing facilities, provisions for alternate routes, and expanded sound side access.
- The Bodie Island district, especially the area from ramp 1 to Oregon Inlet, has the highest concentration of visitors per square mile of all the beaches within the park. At best there is one or perhaps two rangers working 27+ miles from ramp 1 to ramp 27 plus the Bodie lighthouse, the visitors center, the fishing center, camp ground and highway 12 from Nags Head to south of Salvo while also lending assistance to Pea Island WLR. 12 to 16 hours per day is the best we can expect from enforcement rangers and we (as well as the perpetrators) know that no rangers are routinely on duty after dark much less @ 2-3 am. We don't need additional regulations we need enforcement of current statutes. Resource closures are dictated by ESA and the visiting public knows or can be made aware of the necessity. Neither me nor you can satisfactorily explain or justify expansive closures that keep visitors from their park because a bird "may" want to land and/or build a nest. Protect what exists but don't build a "Field of Dreams". Turtle closures are understood but should be moved from the Bodie Island beaches that go under water every year. The visiting public, who come here often, lose respect for resource management that would rather dig up cold, lifeless eggs than hatch baby turtles. Visitors were guaranteed access to the "Bait Pond" under previous Superintendent's Order #7. This access is no longer guaranteed and neither is access to the sound side of the spit. By not opening these areas you

will endanger the children who currently have relatively safe beach areas to recreate. Continuing to keep most of the spit closed has allowed grasses and brush to grow over large areas making them unfit for the shorebirds that formally occupied these areas. Mismanagement has forced many birds into areas occupied by visiting humans and unnecessarily creating many of our current problems. Open these areas (outside of the nesting season) to ORV traffic and if necessary bring in equipment to restore the sand spit formally populated by both birds and visitors.

- The Bodie Island district has the highest concentration of visitors per square mile in the entire Park. 2 Enforcement Officers are assigned to cover these 27 + miles of beach in the peak season. We don't need additional rules, permits, carrying capacity limits. We need more enforcement of existing rules and regulations. Keeping the spit closed has allowed brush and grasses to cover large areas formerly considered prime habitat for shorebirds. Due to mismanagement they are now forced into areas occupied by humans as similarly as the alligators of the Everglades, the bears in Yellowstone and the elk in Glacier National Park among others. Restoration of this sand spit will help restore the bird population.
- This area of the Park has seen a lot of growth over the years. It is now perhaps the most used area of the Park. As a result, more presence of Park LE personnel is needed to help enforce the rules already in place. Before we put new rules in place that limit the use of ORV's, lets enforce the rules we have by increasing LE personnel, making fines for aggressive, and educational efforts to the public. The public, by in large, wants to protect the Park, not harm it.

## **8. Site Specific Management: Hatteras Island Ranger District**

### **8.A. Establish ORV Use Areas and Passive Recreation Areas (Either Seasonal or Year-round)**

**8.A.1** Establish a year-round ORV use area from Ramp 27 to Ramp 30. (*status quo*)

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Doesn't happen as it is quite often closed between ramps.
- 8.A.1 is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003.
- But increase from ramp 27 to ramp 37

#### **May Be Effective**

- Should be ramp 23 to 34 to be effective
- This should be ramp 23-30. and 20 should open during the off-season.
- Having beach to go to is great. Greater is having beach to go to is, having the beach be where the fish are.
- Effective when no closures are in place, but when closures are in place there should be an ORV corridors what can be weaved around closures. When closures are in place drivers of ORVs should be allowed to park vehicles and access the beach outside the closure as a pedestrian.
- I agree but this should begin at ramp 23 and go to ramp 34

#### **Not Effective**

- Should be 23 to 34
- The area from ramp 34 to ramp 44 should be a passive year round recreational area.

**8.A.2** Establish a passive recreation area seasonally in the summer around Ramp 43 in front of the life guarded beach. (*status quo*)

### **Definitely Effective**

- 8.A. is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003.
- Continue this procedure as long as there are lifeguards at the beach and don't tell us that you can't afford it like the last couple of years.

### **May Be Effective**

- Establish a designated ORV access corridor near the back of the beach.
- This means towards the old lighthouse site of the ramp. Not the Point side of the ramp.
- Make this area passive recreation only year-round.
- If you make this a passive beach keep S3 open to the south and create an access at the north end of the present parking area so SUVs can bypass the swimming area and continue on towards the old lighthouse site.
- As long as passive area is removed after summer(Sept.15)

### **Not Effective**

- Need a pass through behind the life guard station
- Would be much better to have some sort of pass through to let ORVs to get off the beach.
- The pass through behind the life guard station
- Not enough pedestrian use
- There is no lifeguard at Ramp 43. It would be fine to designate from the jetties south for 3/10 of a mile as a lifeguard beach and keep it closed to ORV access year around. From that point south, approx. one mile to Ramp 43 should be open to ORV use year around. This one mile of beach is just not used even in the summer and people who want to see no ORVs can walk north for at least a mile and not see ORVs. See note on "passive recreation" areas at end.
- Lack of parking at Ramp 43 life guard area should be moved to lighthouse area where parking is available.
- Beach should have a pass through behind the lifeguard station.

**8.A.3** Establish an ORV use area from Ramp 43 to Cape Point year-round. (*status quo*)

### **Definitely Effective**

- Expand it to Ramp 49
- Expand ORV area from the groins at the old lighthouse to a mile south of ramp 49
- With clearing the grass & brush around the pond, the birds would have more of this same area to use. As it is now birds are being forced closer & closer to the tide line, because they want to stay away from where predators can hide.

- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15.

**May Be Effective**

- Should extend to Ramp 49 from north of 43
- Do away with ramp 43. Make the area from Ramp 44 north to ramp 34 a year round passive recreation area.

**Not Effective**

- Unless it can be demonstrated that ORV use does not adversely impact on species.
- This should read from 1/3 of a mile south of the jetties to one mile west of Ramp 49 with the current by-pass near Ramp 44 and a lengthened interdunal road from Ramp 44 south to just short of the Frisco campground.

**8.A.4** Establish a passive recreation area from Frisco to Ramp 55, which is currently closed for safety reasons. (*status quo*)

**Definitely Effective**

- If the passive area starts at in front of NPS Frisco campground.

**May Be Effective**

- open to ORV when safe
- If closure is not for pedestrian safety reasons
- This should be maintained with regard to cottages not being allowed access until after September 15 and until May 15<sup>th</sup>. Speed within an area should such as this should be at 10mph.

**Not Effective**

- Need a ramp south of Frisco
- please open to ORV's the beach is not the playground of the wealthy oceanfront homeowners or their employees. Yes the renters of these "cottages" are working so that the homeowners can pay for their houses
- A ramp should be added south of Frisco Pier and north of Hatteras Village.
- I see no safety reasons warranting this closure. These areas should only be closed in front of the villages during summer
- In the off season this beach is wasted. There is nobody using it. There are many areas along that shore where fishing is good, however there is no way for me to get there.
- As per the accompanying map Frisco to Ramp 55 is passive use on a seasonal basis ONLY. This policy provides for adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15.
- What's unsafe about the area south of Frisco? Bandits? Packs of maurauding ghost crabs? Dick Cheyney with a gun? The seasonal closures in front of the villages make good sense. The beaches should be open to ORVs the rest of the time.

- There are parts of this beach which should be accessed by a new ramp, but if more passive area is needed then seasonally open it from the Frisco pier to the current day use area and build a ramp to the south of the current day use area.
- Summer Passive area in front of houses south of ramp 49 as status quo is effective; however, extending this passive beach area sets precedent and is privatizing the beach for Ocean front home owns and is no permissible. Presently this beach is closed for politic reasons and should not be closed for ORV use. In the past it has been closed for safety reasons that I can be satisfied. If the several miles between the bathhouse and boardwalk west of Frisco Pier and the village of Hatteras are deemed safe for ORV use there should be a good portion of this beach re-opened. The first half-mile west of the parking area and bathhouse and the half mile area east of house in Hatteras Village could be considered for passive use, but ramps and access between these two area should be provided for ORV use. The beach within the village of Hatteras should be only seasonally closed to prevent the privatization issue as is the Frisco Village permanent closure.
- The Frisco ramp at the pier should be opened in the off-season and the beaches in front of Frisco and to Ramp 55 opened to ORV use as it has historically been. See note on "passive recreation" areas at end.
- Additional ramps needed south of Frisco pier and north of Hatteras villages.
- A ramp should be put in just south of Frisco Pier and another just north of Hatteras Village
- This area was closed years ago for safety reasons. The Park has received a lot of communication in recent months regarding this area. Weather conditions have changed and the beach is now much wider and safety problems no longer exist (as they did before Hurricane Isabel). The beach should be open to ORV use. A new ramp should be put into place with appropriate parking. The new ramp should be somewhere south of Frisco pier and North of Hatteras Village. The beach in front of Frisco, particularly the section south of Frisco pier and North of Hatteras Village is an excellent example of the necessity of closing a beach for safety reasons BUT having guidelines in place that allow the superintend to re-open the beach once it is safe to do so.

**8.A.5** Establish an ORV use area from Ramp 55 to Hatteras Inlet. (*status quo*)

**Definitely Effective**

- Quite often closed.
- Again bulldozing the end of the spit into one big pile would open huge amounts of space currently unavailable to birds for nesting & rest.
- 8.A.5 is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003.

**May Be Effective**

- Pole road must be maintained and restored to it's original state plus widening to two lanes all of the way.

**Not Effective**

- Unless it can be demonstrated that ORV use does not adversely impact on species.

**8.A.6** Continue the current ORV corridor from Ramp 55 on the beach and along Pole Road/Spur Road to end of the spit for ORV use when no resource closures or storm related safety closures are present. (*status quo*)

**Definitely Effective**

- Keep it maintained

- improve that corridor
- If the spit where cleared the resource closure could be kept farther away from the beach that the fishermen want to use.
- 8.A.6 is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003.
- This has to be done better, NPS has dropped the ball here. Pole Road needs to be repaired and made functional to the inlet. Access also to the sound. Poor management here by NPS. Dunes that were built back 80 years ago have not been repaired. This alone shows the lack of management effectiveness and just one of many reasons for lack of trust in NPS and wildlife management.

### **May Be Effective**

- Pole road must be maintained and restored to it's original state plus widening to two lanes all of the way.
- New corridors should also be explored to find other ways for ORVs and pedestrians to access that beach, as it is one of the best on the island.

### **Not Effective**

- Close the pole road unless properly maintained and patrolled, don't go through wetlands or developing wetlands or drain ephemeral fresh water ponds.

**8.A.7** Leave Ramp 23 open and add additional parking for pedestrians as this area does not presently have heavy ORV use.

### **Definitely Effective**

- This would work for the beach on the north side of this ramp, leaving the south side for ORVs, in-season. Off-season open the whole beach to ORVs.
- I live here – busy only on Saturday and Sunday at ramp 23. Any time this beach is hardly used from ramp 23 to 27. Close if for some birds?
- Why is additional parking needed here? There is additional parking on Sound side for overflow. Is there a real issue here in the summer? If not, no need to add a parking lot when one exist on the sound side as well as on the ocean side. Can the sound side opposite Ramp 23 be enhanced for parking with walk over provided to beach side?

### **May Be Effective**

- Open ramp 20 in except for the summer season.
- May need a walkway. And allow orv's south only

### **Not Effective**

- I believe this area is a high use ORV section and have seen it on many occasions
- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15. This alternative states that ramp 23 should remain open but then calls for pedestrian access as the ramp does not have heavy ORV access. This is extremely confusing and sounds like alternative 7.H.4, thus my comment is the same. Expansion of year round passive recreation closures in the area of ramp 23 is not required and serves one purpose only--to limit off-season access to otherwise deserted beaches. See pictures

attached "Additional Comments\_off season use". With respect to increased parking, if observed usage indicates this is needed by all means do it.

**8.A.8** Close Ramp 23 to 1 mile north of Ramp 27 to ORV use and establish a passive recreation area year-round. In addition, expand parking at Ramp 23 and close the ramp.

#### **May Be Effective**

- This may be a good option for day pedestrian use. This option would be better than closing other stretches of ORV access beaches.
- It would depend on what other areas there are for passive recreation.
- If this is to be used as a recreational area, leave the ramps open and have ORV usage via corridors with drivers leaving vehicles parked and corridors and accessing the beach as a pedestrian.

#### **Not Effective**

- area is used by ORVs leave it open. there are miles of no-ORV areas north of Rodanthe and south of Avon
- Leaving this ramp open and adding parking would be the most effective solution.
- Leaving the ramp and ORV open and increasing parking, restrooms, bath area is best. Also consider new ramp at 25 or so. Closing ramp 23 is not good because the long walk to the beach. (comment repeated for 8.A.9-8.A.10)
- Seasonal closure north of ramp 23 for passive recreational area
- Ramp 23 is very popular with renters in the tri-village area
- this is a long hike and will not be done by many, keep ramp 23 open to ramp 34
- You cannot walk from Rt 12 to the beach south of ramp 23
- No reason to close 23 to ORVs
- This is going backwards. There is no need to take that much beach. If the area north of 23 becomes crowded, and ramps 2 & 4 are fully used, let's talk.
- 8.A.8 The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15. Expansion of year round passive recreation closures to the areas between ramp 23 and ramp 27 is not required and serves one purpose only--to limit off-season access to otherwise deserted beaches. See pictures attached "Additional Comments\_off season use". With respect to increased parking, if observed usage indicates this is needed by all means do it. With respect to the premise that the number of cottages in the RSW area is expanding, they cannot possibly expand beyond the current village boundary which ends north of ramp 23--that is, the premise for this alternative is flawed
- Ramp 23 is a high use area. Keep ramp 23 open to ramp 27. Increase parking at ramp 23. If ramp 23 is closed, this beach would become unusable because of the distance from highway 12 to the beach.
- Tri-village area has Pea Island Refuge as close to the north as Ramp 23 is to the south with many miles of passive use. Partner with USFW to make more parking accesses within this area for passive use. This is also causing less area of ORV use and creating future crowding in the open areas. (comment repeated for 8.A.9)
- You are just making areas open to ORV use more crowded, leave ramp 23 as it is and increase parking. People can turn left at Ramp 23 and walk for almost 17 miles and not see an ORV in the summer. It is not realistic to expect to have the beach to yourself when this Seashore has over 2.2 million visitors a year. This option would set

aside about three miles of beach to a handful of people. This must remain a multi-use beach for all visitors. See note on "passive recreation" areas at end.

- There are no pedestrian access points available along Rt. 12 south of Ramp 23.

**8.A.9** Establish a seasonal passive recreation area in front of the tri-village area south to one mile north of Ramp 27. Close seasonally to ORV use.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Complete ban on ORV year round is not necessary to meet objectives to me, but may create a safer feel for the pedestrians in the trivillage area.
- Close in summer season only

#### **Not Effective**

- There is Pea Island to the north that is open for passive daytime recreational use year round
- That would really overcrowd one area of the beach
- Only close in front of villages
- Seasonal in front of the villages, north of ramp 23 if there is a need, but not past 23. There are not enough reasons to take the next 4 miles for passive use.
- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15. Given the expansion of ORV closures resulting from Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003, expansion of passive use areas will only create more congestion in ORV areas and it totally unacceptable.
- that's too much taken away from ORV's.
- Maintain the existing seasonal passive area which is approximately one mile north of ramp 23. The passive area in front of the tri-villages has been sufficient for many years and will still be.
- Ramp 23 gets users from the 3 villages as it is the most convenient beach access for them. Why not put effort and education into directing the passive beach goers to Pea Island. Why not try to work out some cooperation with Pea Island whereby NPS would put in parking spaces just north of the S curves and also perhaps half way to Pea Island hdqts. Both are units of Interior Dept lets get some cooperation and negotiation there. After all in 1978 all of Pea Island was closed to us and the only concession was to allow passive access.
- It should be from Ramp 23 to the tri-village as it currently is. Closing ramp 23 is unacceptable. Leaving ramp 23 open and increasing parking at ramp 23 will be the most effective way to utilize this. Closing this ramp would not be effective as you cannot walk from the highway to the beach south of ramp 23.
- The people at the tri-village have a built in recreation area. It is called Pea Island. Why should this village have a recreational area North AND South of the village. And, on the sound side of Ramp 23 there is plenty of parking for overflow from Ramp 23 parking lot.

**8.A.10** Establish a year-round passive recreation area in front of the tri-village area south to one mile north of Ramp 27. Close year-round to ORV use.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Complete ban on ORV year round is not necessary to meet objectives to me, but may create a safer feel for the pedestrians in the trivillage area.

### **Not Effective**

- Provides village residents with exclusive beach access at the detriment of others.
- open in fall and winter
- Seasonal ORV use
- That would really overcrowd one area of the beach
- There is no economic or any other justification to close that much beach off-season to ORVs. The villagers did not buy private beach when they purchased their beach-front house.
- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15. Expansion of year round passive recreation closures to the areas between ramp 23 and ramp 27 is not required and serves one purpose only--to limit off-season access to otherwise deserted beaches. See pictures attached "Additional Comments\_off season use".
- The only people who visit this area in the off periods are ORV users
- Ramp 23 gets users from the 3 villages as it is the most convenient beach access for them. It would be a b big step backward to take away that 4 mile stretch of beach year round
- Tri-village area has Pea Island Refuge as close to the north as Ramp 23 is to the south with many miles of passive use. Partner with USFW to make more parking accesses within this area for passive use. This is also causing less area of ORV use and creating future crowding in the open areas. Closing any beach other than seasonally in front of villages is privatizing these areas to mostly Ocean front home owners and is not allowable.
- Diverting excess numbers from Ramp 4 sends them to Ramp 23 do not close this and send more traffic to 27 & beyond.
- New ocean side developments (as in Salvo) with expensive homes should not be allowed to influence the use of our beaches. These folks can share the beach with ORV users just like the folks at Avon share at ramp 34. If they want to be 'away' from ORV users, they have all of Pea Island.

**8.A.11** Designate an ORV corridor from 1 mile north of Ramp 27 to Ramp 34.

### **Definitely Effective**

- corridor to bypass closures would be very effective
- Add new interdunal access around resource and safety closures to give full access.

### **May Be Effective**

- This is not a high pedestrian area, use the whole beach for ORVs and not just a corridor
- Leaving the ramp and ORV open and increase parking, restrooms, bath area is best. Also consider new ramp at 25 or so. A ORV corridor t bypass closures would work well.
- A corridor is more than a road/trail, right? This corridor could be used by somebody wanting to fish, sunbathe, picnic, or any other beach use.

- But should be 1 mile North of Ramp 23.

**Not Effective**

- Ask questions a different way to get the answers you might want...Done throughout this document. Do not take away a mile of access to north of ramp 27...
- This would be restrictive and would not benefit very limited pedestrian usage
- ORV access is already provided for between ramps 27 and ramp 34. If the intent of this alternative is to provide for a limited corridor similar to that described in 6.B.10 then my comment is the same as in 6.B.10. That is, due to the constantly changing dune line, it is not feasible or necessary to define corridors in areas where there is a well defined dune line. Park resources would be more effectively utilized by increasing enforcement efforts.
- Season closures in front of the villages are acceptable, ORV corridor should be from Ramp 20 to Ramp 34. Ramp 20 should be reopened in to allow more access for emergency vehicles. A ORV corridor to by-pass closures would be nice.
- What is the reason for this? If it is safety or to bypass temporary closures for Park species, OK. But, if permanent, NO. A corridor would always be temporary due to tide change, etc. It will be impossible to have permanent corridors for passage of ORVs. Corridors must be set up to passthrough areas on a temporary/seasonal basis. If the intention here is to have a "ORV road" from Ramp 27 to Ramp 34, this would not be effective. As an alternative, as part of the regulations for the Park ORV users should be advised to drive at the high dune line, or high tide line. But, setting up permanent "road-ways" will never work.

**8.A.12** Designate a passive recreation area from Ramp 34 north of Avon to Ramp 38 south of Avon.

**Definitely Effective**

- Only in-season. This beach opens to ORV use off-season.
- Would be more effective if it were extended to ramp 44.

**May Be Effective**

- Ramp 34 to Ramp 38 should be open in fall and winter.
- there's enough ORV access on either side of these areas to justify.
- Only if opened during the winter months.

**Not Effective**

- Provides village residents with exclusive beach access at the detriment of others.
- Limits beach access to beach properties
- Does not provide for a variety of appropriate visitor use and will not provide for preserving cultural resources (the Hatteras Island Community and economy)
- I own a home in Avon, if I wanted the beach closed to ORV in front of my house I would of bought a home in Kitty Hawk
- Summer seasonal closure only

- Leaving the ramp and ORV open and increasing parking, restrooms, bath area is best. Also consider new ramp at 25 or so. Closing ramp 23 is not good because the long walk to the beach. Passive rec areas in the tri villages is not necessary. The beaches around the villages are not private beaches.
- Seasonal ORV use. Parking lot with access north of Avon not adjacent to Ramp 34. expand parking lot north of Ramp 38
- Most of this beach is already under seasonal closure
- Ramp 34 to ramp 38 are already closed on a seasonal basis. The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15. If this alternative is for year round passive recreation, the expansion of year round passive recreation closures to the areas between ramp 34 and ramp 38 is not required and serves one purpose only--to limit off-season access to otherwise deserted beaches. See pictures attached "Additional Comments\_off season use".
- There already exists as a passive recreation area the entire beachfront of Avon in the closed season. A parking place and pedestrian access immediately adjoining the northern boundary of Avon with a passive boundary line on the beach 200 yards north of the Avon boundary would be preferable to closing access south of ramp 34. This would open up September 15 just as the villages beaches do now.
- They have summer closure here. This should be enough. Or extend the summer closure to October 15 as discussed in other part of notebook. But, to close this beach entirely to ORVs--NO. Homeowners do not own the beach. The beaches in the Park are not private beaches and they should not be managed as private beaches. If I am denied use of a beach but a homeowner can simply walk across the dune to get to his beach, the park has in effect managed the beach as private property. The ramps and open beaches enable the public to use the beaches. Given the distance from the roads to the beach, closing the ramps and closure to ORVs by definition, creates a private beach. I know a man that owns a home on the ocean in Rhodanthe. He told me once that if ORVs were not allowed, he would have a very "private beach because no one ever comes over the dune to use the beach around here but the people renting the cottages" This should not be allowed by the Park.

**8.A.13** Close Ramp 34 to Ramp 43 to ORV access (this area includes villages). Close Ramp 38 to ORV access and expand parking.

#### **May Be Effective**

- I think 8.A.12 would be plenty
- Would be effective if it were to ramp 44. Ramp 43 is redundant and should be removed, expand the parking lot for passive users to access the beach North of there..

#### **Not Effective**

- Provides village residents with exclusive beach access at the detriment of others.
- If seasonal closure is necessary, it should be only from south of Ramp 34 to north of Ramp38 in front of houses in Avon and just for peak summer season.
- Does not provide for a variety of appropriate visitor use and will not provide for preserving cultural resources (the Hatteras Island Community and economy)
- There is no off season use of this beach except by fishermen. Keep the existing openings in place for ORVs.
- Maintain Sept 15 to May 15 opening.
- This beach is used mainly by fishermen off season—keep current seasonal closures

- Compressing ORV use to a more southern area just compounds the current crowding conditions at Cape Point and the South Beaches.
- Why would you close ramp 38? There are no birds there.
- There is not enough reasons to do this. The villager who bought a beachfront house DID NOT BUY A PRIVATE BEACH. This is valuable fishing beach for ORV users.
- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15. Expansion of year round passive recreation closures to the areas between ramp 34 and ramp 43 is not required and serves one purpose only--to limit off-season access to otherwise deserted beaches. See pictures attached "Additional Comments\_off season use". In the event that observed usage indicates that more parking is needed at any one of the ramps included in this area, by all means provide the needed parking.
- These are not private beaches for the exclusive use of homeowners. The primary use of this beach between 9/15 to 5/15 is by fisherman. Keep it open
- This is highly desirable surf fishing beach in Spring and fall and in the pre Ma . How could this even be considered?
- Only after parking and walk-over ramps are built for public use. No parking on HWY 12 for safety reasons.
- None of these areas should be closed to ORV usage with the use of ORV corridors. This would ensure recreational usage by ORV users even when closures are in place and the parking of the ORVs within corridor would not intrude on the pedestrian usage of the beach.
- Close 34 to 38 "seasonally." Ramp 38 should be kept open to ORV use with expanded parking and facilities.
- Based on my observations, the beach south of Avon at Ramp 38 is rarely used in the off season except by fisherman and an occasional person from the Canadian Hole that crosses over from Highway 12, south of Avon. As for closing the beach from ramp 34 to 43 to include the village areas, I do not think this is effective for the same reasons as given elsewhere in this notebook in respect to Ramp 23 area. Closing beaches in front of villages on a year around basis is not effective. It denies the use of the beaches by all and basically gives the homeowner "private beaches" owned and maintained by the government. This is highly ineffective.

**8.A.14** Continue the current ORV corridor from Ramp 43 to Cape Point to Ramp 49, subject to resource closures and storm/tide related closures.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Provide a beach or interdunal corridor or both so as to have year round through access from cape point, ramp 44/45 to ramp 49
- Let us decide if we want to go out there during storms/tidal events. By clearing the area around the pond, the resource closures could be moved farther inland, freeing valuable ocean front to ORV use.
- 8.A.14 is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003

#### **May Be Effective**

- Keep open always, travel at own risk
- Add additional interdunal roads to ensure park access regardless of resource and storm/tide related closures.

### **Not Effective**

- Should be open out of season up to the jetties.
- Narrow the existing corridor, allowing ORV usage that the ORV users could park vehicle within corridor and still maintain usage as a pedestrian. All this would be dependant on the amount of erosion on these stretches, with corridors immediately open when beaches are wide enough for a corridor to exist. All corridors should be surrounding closures at a satisfactory distance and pedestrian usage, after the vehicle is parked in the corridor.
- Some parts should be vehicle free – need to provide a way for pedestrians to experience one of the most dramatic areas of the park without vehicles.

### **(No Selection)**

- Ramp 44 to a ramp that would be built at the East boundary of Frisco campground. It would only be opened when Frisco campground was closed.

**8.A.15** Provide a passive recreation area north of Ramp 49 in front of Frisco Campground. Allow ORVs to pass through (no parking) on the upper beach to access beaches to the north.

### **Definitely Effective**

- The current ORV and pass through in front of the Frisco campground is best

### **May Be Effective**

- Summer season only. Full ORV Access other seasons
- For .25 of a mile. Access south is already closed seasonally
- Provide the area only extends in front of the camp ground
- It would be more effective to move ramp 49 East.
- Years ago there was a pass through this area in the summer time and it worked well. You could also access the beach by going through the Frisco campground by building an access to the east of the passive area.

### **Not Effective**

- Most campers use ORV's here and park near the ramp.
- This is one of the most popular sections of beach for the locals, leave it alone for them to enjoy.
- Access to the beach from Frisco campground is viable but not often used because of the length of the walk in the summer heat with beach paraphanlia. That said, it is possible that a short section (no more than a football field in length) in front of the boardwalk could benefit from this concept but the emphasis of this beach should be left as is, family access via ORV. This beach is quite heavily used by families with small children and ORVs. The reason is quite simple, this is the one stretch of beach within CHNSRA that is consistently flat, easy to drive on, and very conducive to swimming because of the lack of drop offs and currents. Closing this area to ORVs will increase the potential for user conflicts in other areas and have a negative impact on the experiences of family oriented visitors that seek out this beach because of its structure.
- Do not blend the areas . This will not work and is unsafe.
- Ban ORV access in front of Frisco Campground for safety reasons.

- In the past Ramp 49 west to ramp 55 has been closed for safety reasons. If the several miles between the bathhouse and boardwalk west of Frisco Pier and the village of Hatteras are deemed safe for ORV use there should be a good portion of this beach re-opened. The first half-mile west of the parking area and bathhouse and the half mile east of house in Hatteras Village could be considered for passive use, but ramps and access between these two area should be provided for ORV use. This half mile area should satisfy passive use needs. (Comment repeated for 8.A.17 and 8.A.18)

**8.A.16** Expand the parking areas on the access road to the Frisco campground for additional parking. This option would include providing fencing and signage around the airstrip to keep pedestrians out of this area for safety reasons.

**Definitely Effective**

- Great for people without ORV's

**May Be Effective**

- Not sure what 'safety reasons' are being referred to here.
- Provide safe pedestrian path, off the road to access beaches
- It is a long way to the beach here. Publicity and better access including parking in the area between the Frisco Pier and the day use area would provide a better experience.
- Expand closer towards Ramp 49 with restroom facilities.

**Not Effective**

- There is no need to bypass the runway through ½ mile of green space.
- Has anybody tried to walk in that area? Snakes & cactus are thick, deer ticks are on every blade of grass & bush. That is a nasty area to try to take a 1/3mile walk to the beach. South of Frisco or the old lighthouse area offer much better convenience for somebody wanting to access the beach. By walking from the paved road. Plus there are lifeguards.
- Accessing the beach from this road requires a long walk through brush that harbors snakes, etc. This being the case, parking areas along this road would represent an incredible waste of scarce resources. Providing boardwalks would not resolve this issue as the walk, while less dangerous, would still be intimidating to most visitors.
- Why would anyone want to hike thru cactus, sandspurs & snakes to access a small beach area?

**8.A.17** Manage the beach between Ramp 49 and Ramp 55 (in front of Frisco and Hatteras Villages) consistent with the approach selected for other village beaches.

**Definitely Effective**

- As long as that means opening this beach to ORV use during the off-season. The people who bought these beachfront houses did not buy private beach. The only reason ORV use (in the off-season) was stopped was narrow beach. The beach is now wide enough to allow seasonal use.
- There is simply no justification for treating one village differently from another.
- All the village beaches should be Passive Access only.
- These are public beaches & should be open to the public, except for seasonal closures. The present form of management has led some property owners to believe they have their own private beach.

### **May Be Effective**

- Hatteras villages and Avon villages need to come in compliance with others – not there private beaches for the beach front homes.

### **Not Effective**

- There is only a small part of the beach open in front of the villages and the cottages therefore this is not necessary.
- Area should be open to ORV use once beach width allows. Many ocean-front property owners now consider this area their private beach since it has been closed for so long. To continue this closure will effectively privatize public lands for private use.
- No access to beach through houses and no parking also. Until access is built, area should remain open to ORVs

**8.A.18** Designate the area between Ramp 49 and Ramp 55 a passive recreation area and close it to ORV use.

### **Not Effective**

- Provides village residents with exclusive beach access at the detriment of others.
- It should only be closed during the peak summer months.
- This is a stretch of beach that needs to remain open to allow flow of traffic and is wide enough in most places to allow mixed use.
- There is only a small part of the beach open in front of the villages and the cottages therefore this is not necessary.
- Seasonal ORV uses
- No reasonable way for pedestrians to get to the beach
- Too large of an area to close to ORV use. No cottages exist for several miles.
- This beach is always closed.
- Not only is there no reason for this. There are very few folks who use this beach in the off-season. ORV fishermen would like to have access to this area. We have been kept out for 7 or so years.
- The current split between passive use and ORV use areas provides adequate access for all types of users. The only possible change that can be justified would be to adjust the time frame for seasonal closures to May 1 through October 15. Expansion of year round passive recreation closures to the areas between ramp 49 and ramp 55 is not required and serves one purpose only--to limit off-season access to otherwise deserted beaches. See pictures attached "Additional Comments\_off season use". In the event that observed usage indicates that more parking is needed at any one of the ramps included in this area, by all means provide the needed parking.
- too restrictive. Orvs need access during off season when visitors are minimal
- This would further strengthen the feeling that homeowners in Frisco and Hatteras have their own private beach. 49 to 55 is entirely too much area for walk-on entertainment until we get giant increases in visitation.
- If these beaches are wide enough to drive than they should be open to all and not a select few. Ramp at Frisco should re-opened for off season use by ORV's and the beaches re-opened to ORV's if wide enough in the off season.

- This is not effective because: These are public beaches & should be open to the public, except for seasonal closures. The present form of management has led some property owners to believe they have their own private beach.

**8.A.19** Close the sound shoreline access from Cable Crossing to Spur Road outlet during the winter season.

**May Be Effective**

- may help protect wildlife.
- Not sure that this is a good idea as I have not been back there but it sounds like it cuts off access to a lot of people and is not necessary.
- The sound shoreline should be closed to ORVs year round.

**Not Effective**

- No benefit
- Sound side access is a destination for hunters, clamers, calipers, and others. Closure of the Spur Road would padlock this portion of the beach to all user and would increase the breeding of feral cats and raccoons and would increase the threat to shore birds and other species
- Safety and resource closures
- Many types of activities happen on this shoreline. Clamming, scalloping and fishing are just a few. The only wildlife in there is feral cats.
- The rationale for this proposal is unclear. With respect to visitor use there is no reason for this closure. With respect to species protection, as per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate. If any changes are made, they should be to reduce the number and size of resource closures.
- Why would you want to block off those people who utilize the sound for activities perhaps other than fishing by closing access at this time of year.
- Spur Road is in effect and valuable intradunal road and as such provides a real service. Don't close.
- This road is needed for access to fishing spots.

**8.A.20** Close both ocean and soundside shoreline areas to ORV access south/west of the Spur Road to the end of the spit year-round establishing a passive recreation area.

**May Be Effective**

- may help protect wildlife.

**Not Effective**

- No passive access, maximum fishing impact
- That would effectively close the beach totally, no one would want to walk that far through soft sand carrying fishing, surfing or other beach user equipment.
- This would destroy the local economy.

- Sound side access is a destination for hunters, clamers, calipers, and others. Closure of the Spur Road would padlock this portion of the beach to all user and would increase the breeding of feral cats and raccoons and would increase the threat to shore birds and other species.
- Safety and resource closures
- Orv's about the only way to get out there
- Just how would these passive recreation folks get way out there? It would be better for the birds to clear the grasses & brush out on the spit to allow for room for nesting/resting without crowding fishermen.
- The rationale for this proposal is unclear. With respect to visitor use there is no reason for this closure. With respect to species protection, as per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate. If any changes are made, they should be to reduce the number and size of resource closures.
- This area is prime fishing area and I wonder if passive users are going to walk from 55 to have a volley ball game or bird watch.
- So much of the sound side shore is now only passive in use and this in a very popular location that for generations locals and visitors have frequented for oysters, clams, scallops and other activities. The option also fails to list what months winter encompasses and could affect good fishing times as well. On the ocean the passive area during summer village closures and east of Hatteras Village proposed in my earlier comments should satisfy all passive needs on Ocean side in the Hatteras Village area
- How would anyone get there if not for ORV. No one would walk there as can be shown by the lack of use of the trail that Supt. Belli put in to get back to the popular scalloping site near the washover after Isabell. People can not be expected to carry fishing gear, swimming gear (umbrella, cooler, chairs etc for that distance. See note on "passive recreation" areas at end.
- soundside fishing is wonderful when you are on a limited vacation and the ocean is really hard to fish (wind, rough surf etc)

**8.A.21** Close the ocean shoreline south of Spur Road to the inlet to ORV use during the breeding season.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Sensitive breeding areas should be closed to ORV use during breeding season.

#### **May Be Effective**

- If there's sufficient proof to validate that the wildlife would benefit.

#### **Not Effective**

- no birds, no closure
- Sound side access is a destination for hunters, clamers, calipers, and others. Closure of the Spur Road would padlock this portion of the beach to all user and would increase the breeding of feral cats and raccoons and would increase the threat to shore birds and other species.
- Terrible idea. Not only are visitors shut out, but the real problem (feral cats/raccoons) would thrive and multiply.
- no, areas around observed nests or fledglings only
- Subject to closure rules for active nests
- Birds have existed with these roads open to ORV use.

- Nope. Clear the spit to allow the birds more areas to use
- As per the biological opinion and the FONSI, the Interim Plan is more than adequate. If any changes are made, they should be to reduce the number and size of resource closures.
- Again you create major portions of the beach or sound side closed that are highly used by recreational visitors and in a highly washover area. Instead why don't you partner with Corp. of Engineer and other entities to provide more and larger dredge spoil islands in the sound that can be created, maintained and closed to public as resting and breeding areas for this wild life. The area of Cape Hatteras Seashore is a shoulder area for both nesting and wintering plovers and be at the edge of their habitat makes it a poor choice for the high cost of trying to increase their populous here. Instead you can take Portsmouth Island who only sees a small percentage of visitors compared to this recreational seashore to do these closures. Portsmouth has little dune structure and many better areas to promote nest and wintering habitats. Also in the vegetated portion of this area that have become unfit for breeding habitat open portions of them each winter to ORV and encourage use of the vegetated area opened to expand the habitat needed for breeding the next season.
- Closing this area of the Park to all users is unacceptable & without human intervention, it would lead to the increase in breeding of feral cats and raccoons.

## **8.B. Establish an Interdunal Road from Ramp 44 to Ramp 49**

**8.B.1** Establish an Interdunal Road from Ramp 44 to Ramp 49 that would be used only as an alternate route when there is a complete beach closure on South Beach.

### **Definitely Effective**

- total beach closure of South beach should never occur. Access corridors and/or monitoring should be maintained.
- It already existed during the 70's and 80's.

### **May Be Effective**

- But only if closures are forced by NPS.
- This would work to minimize beach traffic and would provide access around closures. Would provide some options during closures. This planned interdunal road would provide access, less conflicts, and pullouts or parking would improved prime bird watching areas.
- Interdunal roads seem to have less impact
- Clearing the brush from around the pond to ramp 45 would give the birds more room away from the shoreline. The inner dunal road to ramp 49 is a good idea.
- There is never an acceptable time for a completed beach closure but an interdunal road would be nice to use for access around temporary closures and areas where tide and weather have caused safety issues.

### **Not Effective**

- Why limit the this alternate route to periods of resource closures? The remenants of such a road already exist, thus the reponing of the old road require little in the way of resources or additional development. In light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003. This alternative would go a long way in restoring the type of access visitors have become accustomed to. Furthermore, this type of road would provide an escape route during periods of extremely high tides. (comment repeated for 8.B.2 and 8.B.3)
- New Interdunal Roads are not compatible with Cape Hatteras Enabling Legislation.

- Too much potential resource damage. Use the highway instead of plowing up 4-5 miles of vegetation and other resources.
- Such a two lane road should be open year around and only crossovers to beach that is closed should be closed but not the road itself. (repeated for 8.B.2)

**(No Selection)**

- Establishing additional inter-dunal roads through park service land is unnecessary, expensive to police and maintain, and will expose sensitive natural resources to further erosion. In this case the status quo is the preferred, continue to use the existing inter-dunal road NC 12, which is maintained by the NCDOT.

**8.B.2** Establish an Interdunal Road from Ramp 44 to Ramp 49 to be open seasonally, with beach access subject to resource closures and storm/tide related safety closures.

**May Be Effective**

- may have some wildlife concerns, only reason I see a seasonal approach.
- If opened year round
- Should be changed to kept open for the entire year except when nesting and other hatches require temporary closures. This planned interdunal road would provide access, less conflicts, and pullouts or parking would improved prime bird watching areas.
- Clearing brush/scrub from the pond to ramp 45 would open huge areas for bird use. Creating parking areas for birders & others off this inner dunal road would be a good idea.

**Not Effective**

- needs to be kept open year round
- New Interdunal Roads are not compatible with Cape Hatteras Enabling Legislation.

**(No Selection)**

- Establishing additional inter-dunal roads through park service land is unnecessary, expensive to police and maintain, and will expose sensitive natural resources to further erosion. In this case the status quo is the preferred, continue to use the existing inter-dunal road NC 12, which is maintained by the NCDOT.

**8.B.3** Establish an Interdunal Road from Ramp 44 to Ramp 49 that would be open all the time, with beach access subject to resource closures and storm/tide related safety closures.

**May Be Effective**

- This is a good idea but must limited to actual sightings and confirmed nesting's. This planned interdunal road would provide access, less conflicts, and pullouts or parking would improved prime bird watching areas.
- Again clearing the area around the pond to ramp 45 would open huge areas for bird use. Allowing ORV access to this area during the fall/winter would help keep down the growth of new vegetation.
- Should be two lanes wide.
- This interdunal road would provide access, less conflicts, and with pullouts or parking would provide for excellent bird watching opportunities.

## **Not Effective**

- New Interdunal Roads are not compatible with Cape Hatteras Enabling Legislation.

## **(No Selection)**

- Establishing additional inter-dunal roads through park service land is unnecessary, expensive to police and maintain, and will expose sensitive natural resources to further erosion. In this case the status quo is the preferred, continue to use the existing inter-dunal road NC 12, which is maintained by the NCDOT.

## **8.C. Provide Additional Soundside Access and Parking**

**8.C.1** Expand the parking lot and close Ramps 58 and 59 (soundside ramps) at Canadian Hole (Kite Point). The road to the parking lot would be paved with shell and clay, with the road leading to the expanded parking lot. ORV access would not be permitted beyond this road and parking lot.

### **Definitely Effective**

- High use is degrading the vegetation of the area, establish a pedestrian access trail with interpretative signs.
- As long as parking is expanded, possibly another parking lot just south of Canadian hole.

### **May Be Effective**

- When safety permits access should be restored
- Is ramp 58 east of rt12? If it is there is limited space and that dune is fragile & very important. Crossing this dune could open the next inlet during the next big storm. The farther north the crossing the better. Parking should be increased on the west(soundside) in this area.
- Due to narrow conditions in this area this may be good, but only if a boat ramp is included on one of the parking areas.

### **Not Effective**

- Expand the current parking lot but have 2 lane accesses to eliminate over crowding and conflicts.
- parking lot needs to be expanded and another access opened
- Kite boarders and others have to drive with their gear to reach the sound—larger parking lot would help—58 and 59 ramps should be enlarged
- Access to this area is sufficient. Under no circumstance should access be curtailed.
- There is no conflict now. Kite and widsurfers worked it out amongst themselves and it works great.

**8.C.2** Maintain Ramps 57 and 60 for ORV access, but replace and upgrade signs showing where ORV use is allowed and use bollards or another method to keep ORVs on the established path and mitigate the resource damage currently occurring at Ramp 57.

### **Definitely Effective**

- Yes, keep ORVs on the sound side of rt12.
- If access is two lanes wide for safety.

### **May Be Effective**

- As long as this access provides passable parking along the corridor. Upgrade and better corridor to access also at the ramp just north of Buxton.

### **Not Effective**

- Access to this area is sufficient. Under no circumstance should access be curtailed. With respect to resource damage at ramp 57, I rarely see any substantial activity in this area. This is most likely because the ramp is not visible and in need of maintenance.
- Do away with ramps 57 and 60. Establish a pedestrian access trail.

**8.C.3** Formalize and designate approved ORV access routes. Close inappropriate ORV access routes and provide alternatives for parking.

### **May Be Effective**

- Determine the reason for access and provide more parking to accommodate visitors
- The ORV plan should formally designate and approve all ORV routes. By definition, any not approved are dis-approved. To approve or dis-approve becomes the issue of any area. What are the reasons for needed access? What are the reasons for closure? ORV users have been losing beach for ORV use not gaining (over an extended time frame). The loss of more beach should be significantly minimized to have an effective ORV plan.

### **Not Effective**

- this opens pandora's box to trail closure
- Determine the reason for access and create more parking to accommodate the needs of the visitor. Open more access points not less.
- ORV usage should determine ORV routes, not vice versa
- If someone is accessing an area there must be a reason. Let's accommodate them by expanding parking & providing more access points, not less.

### **No Selection**

- First review "unappropriate routes" to see why they exist, Then decide if they should be closed or formalized.

**8.C.4** Provide better signage to indicate the old 4-wheel drive spur roads are closed at Little Kinnakeet Ramp

### **May Be Effective**

- Increase fines to get the point across

### **Not Effective**

- The little Kinnakeet Ramps is a premier fishing location and should have never been closed. The basis for this closure is not founded on ponderence of the facts.
- Might want to reopen this part of the sound up. It would spread out the crowd.
- Better signage is a plus. As for closure of the old 4 wheel drive spur roads, given the loss of sound side access in recent years, maybe thought should be given to opening these spur roads.

**(No Selection)**

- Do you mean the soundside access behind Little Kinnakeet?

**8.C.5** Provide barriers along the road to address the current situation of parking on vegetation and the expanding width of the road.

**May Be Effective**

- Posting signs and enforcing fines for violators
- Make the roads wide enough to park, at least on one side. Tow/ticket violators.
- Also invoke fines and revoke use privileges for violations.
- ORV corridors should not be made permanent and should be woven around any vegetation and be wide enough in intervals along the corridor for parking and beach access as a pedestrian.

**Not Effective**

- May present a hazard
- There should be no fencing on the shoulders.
- Roads fill with water, not properly maintained by Park Service, forcing drivers to use edge of road to achieve traction and preventing water from entering wheel bearings.
- No parking between signs is sufficient
- Barriers may be useful if not too obtrusive. A better solution is to improve parking, ramps, ORV access, etc. With this upgrade, the next solution is enforcement.
- Provide parking areas instead
- Expand the width of the road but do not add barriers to the sides
- Are you talking NC12 or ORV roads? Shoulder of NC12 is already disturbed areas. ORV roads should not have parking off the road path especially on soundside roads until you reach the water.
- Fencing and barriers along highway 12 would be ineffective. There is a genuine need for emergency stopping off of highway 12. Signage should discourage this unless there is a real need. Fencing and barriers destroy the beauty of the Park. People will follow the rules when they are informed. Again presence of LE personnel and enforcement of rules is key to the success of Park management.

**8.D. Provide Alternative Transportation**

**8.D.1** Establish a beach shuttle service to provide controlled access to popular fishing areas such as Cape Point and Hatteras Spit at times if/when those areas are otherwise closed to ORV access due to resource protection closures.

**Definitely Effective**

- a total win win if it comes to a closure.
- Shuttles would provide all users (not just those with ORVs) access to exceptional recreational resources and provide new economic opportunities for local residents.

### **May Be Effective**

- Doesn't really make sense to me to transport people to/through a closed area. It compromises the concept of "closed."

### **Not Effective**

- Too cumbersome
- if shuttles can safely operate, then private ORVs can also
- Not really practical with the amount of gear
- Weather and water conditions along with other factors make this impractical.
- These efforts have been tried and failed before. They are not practical and will not improve the habitat. Folks do not generally like this option. Waiting in lines and getting your gear to the beach is a hassle under this format.
- Beach shuttle should not be used to justify closing ORV access
- There is no way a shuttle service could carry 10 fishermen and equipment to Cape Point. This question was not thought up by a surf fisherman.
- This is the worst idea of all, it would not work. If it did work, it would cost too much. And to top it off when the weather is bad the fishing can be good. Don't make that choice for me
- This is not financially or logistically feasible. Interdunal roads, bypasses, etc. provide much better alternatives to providing access during breeding season.
- COST... THE SHUTTLE TAKES 4 LOADS OF PEOPLE AND A THUNDER STORM BLOWS UP AND YOU CAN'T GET ALL THE PEOPLE OFF THE BEACH.
- Provide ORV access at both areas. A shuttle could not handle all visitors, also there is the question of liability
- Not cost effective and due to high volume use by ORV users. Users also bring rods, reels, coolers. Umbrellas, kiteboards, surf boards etc. making this impossible. Again you create major portions of the beach or sound side closed that are highly used by recreational visitors and in a highly washover area. Instead why don't you partner with Corp. of Engineer and other entities to provide more and larger dredge spoil islands in the sound that can be created, maintained and closed to public as resting and breeding areas for this wild life. The area of Cape Hatteras Seashore is a shoulder area for both nesting and wintering plovers and be at the edge of their habitat makes it a poor choice for the high cost of trying to increase their populous here. Instead you can take Portsmouth Island who only sees a small percentage of visitors compared to this recreational seashore to do these closures. Portsmouth has little dune structure and many better areas to promote nest and wintering habitats. Also in the vegetated portion of this area that have become unfit for breeding habitat open portions of them each winter to ORV and encourage use of the vegetated area opened to expand the habitat needed for breeding the next season. (comment repeated for 8.D.2)

**8.D.2** Establish a boat shuttle service from Hatteras Village to Hatteras Inlet during breeding season, if/when ORV and pedestrian access is otherwise precluded by resource closures.

### **Definitely Effective**

- a total win win if it comes to a closure.

### **May Be Effective**

- IF USUAL ACCESS MUST BE CLOSED, BOAT SHUTTLE WOULD BE BETTER THAN NO WAY TO GET TO BEACH. SOUNDS LIKE A LOGISTICS NIGHTMARE, THOUGH.

### **Not Effective**

- Winds, weather and tide make this futile and not worth the effort
- Beach shuttle should not be used to justify closing ORV access
- You don't realize how much gear people bring. This is not a practical solution.
- It would cost too much, be impractical dependent on weather, and unusable.
- This is not financially or logistically feasible. Interdunal roads, bypasses, etc. provide much better alternatives to providing access during breeding season.
- Provide ORV access at both areas. A shuttle could not handle all visitors, also there is the question of liability

### **Additional comments regarding potential ORV management options at Hatteras Island Ranger District:**

- If ORV access is prohibited in this area it will have a devastating economic impact. I will not have a reason to visit this area if I can not use the beach.
- All efforts / resources should be expended to extend access. All efforts to inhibit access are waste of federal monies.
- More ramps and access are needed in the Buxton Motel area, south of the Canadian Hole and north of Hatteras Village. All spur and interdunal roads should be 2 lane with pull-offs. More sound side access is needed around the village areas and near Avon.
- More access ramps are needed. More interdunal roads are needed if wide enough and bypass areas are available. More ramps are needed between 38 and 44. More sound side access is needed at Avon and the Salvo area. Better ramps and maintenance is needed on all ramps. Providing transportation is not practical. Weather conditions is going to always be a factor and liability is way to high for the NPS. If it were a good idea, someone would already be doing it.
- More ocean-side access (ramps) would be nice to reduce driving on beach to access popular areas such as 'behind the Motels' in Buxton
- Additional ramps are needed in the Buxton Motel area, south of Canadian Hole and north of Hatteras Village. All spur and interdunal roads should be 2 lane with pull offs. More sound side access is needed in the Tri-Village areas & Avon.
- Cape Point Campground should be a designated Army Corps of Engineers project/training exercise with the goal of re-establishing it as THE Beach Camping Gem in the National Park system. With permanent improvements to grading and drainage the site could be restored to past levels of appearance and "quality of experience" - second to none in the country. Why are all but rows A & B of Cape Point CG closed to larger RVs/campers, including during peak season? (Rant over.) My (extended) family and I have been regular visitors to HI since the mid 1960s (I was around 5 at the time). It is only during the past 8-10 years that I have become aware of the (negative) impact that comes with increased seasonal & off-season visitation. In the early years we walked to the beach to fish and swim - and I'm sure we could do it again. I do not believe that ORV use and resource protection are mutually exclusive by any means, however. The vast majority of visitors to HI, in my experience, now use ORVs AND place a premium on doing their part to preserve and protect the HI experience - as they have come to know and love it - for future generations. They will live with beach closures and other inconveniences (fees, permits, regulations) right up to the point that they feel they are no longer experiencing Hatteras as they know and love it. Unfortunately we seem to be closer to that point - for many of us than we are comfortable with. I would hope that any and all changes and "improvements" that are to have a long-term impact on the overall quality of life and experience for HI residents and

visitors alike, man and animal, would be undertaken only after thorough, expert study and analysis of the current situation and intended outcomes by reasonable parties on both sides of the fence. Because we are, after all, talking about building fences. Or so it seems. Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this endeavor. Long live Hatteras Island!

- Provide additional sound side access and boat ramps.
- Additional ramps needed a Buxton Motels area, south of Haulover and north of Hatteras Village. All spur and interdunal roads should be 2 lane with pull offs. More sound side access is needed
- An additional ramp is needed near the Buxton motels, south of the Canadian Hole, and north of Hatteras Village. All spur and interdunal roads should be two lane and have more pull-offs for safety. More sound side access is needed near Avon and in the Tri-village area.
- All the vegetation should be cleared around the salt pond at the Point, on the south & west sides. As well as the vegetation between the pond and ramp 45. This will give the birds more feeding areas, as well as being able to nest farther from the surf line. Once the brush is cleared, ORVs should be allowed to drive in this cleared area during the fall & winter (there should NOT be any resource closures during late fall/winter). That would help keep the vegetation from growing back. As it is now, a large area is fenced off year-round, grasses & weeds are growing closer & closer to the fence edge & the surf line. That forces the birds to nest closer to the fences and the surf. That puts the birds and fishermen on a collision course. The fishermen are being run off because somebody is not willing to try a new idea. The flooding issue at the campground entrance and fish cleaning table has gone on long enough. This area flooded during Hurricane Isabel and was not drained like in past floods, in the same area. The salt killed a thriving freshwater swamp that has grown for 30+ years. My understanding is it is a blocked pipe between the campground and the south beach. Get the permit and correct this. One or two more salt water floods (not drained) will be all it takes to allow salt water to poison the freshwater wells in this area of Buxton. Since this flooding causes the drainfield at the campground to be flooded, harmful bacteria spread through the flood water. There is no way to dilute the flood waters & reduce bacteria. Draining this water into the ocean will dilute it. Sorry it has to be done. If flooding of this area was prevented no bacteria from the drainfield would come up. So open the pipe, prevent future flooding and cure the problem.
- The map which accompanies this workbook indicates that there are NO year round closures in this area. This arrangement is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003. With respect to seasonal closures there may be some basis for extending them from May 1 to October 15. Furthermore, the concept of adaptive management used in the interim plan should be applied to the boundaries of seasonal closures when extensive resource and safety closures are required. Above and beyond the above changes, park resources would be most effective if directed at maintenance, improvements to existing facilities, provisions for alternate routes, and expanded sound side access. Additionally, resources should be directed toward enforcement of existing rules--that is, its not broke don't fix it.
- Many more areas of this district should be available to passive use only. Pedestrians are discouraged under current management policies. Parking lots should be expanded at all ramps to encourage pedestrian access. ORVs should be banned year-round at Cape Point.
- Add more ramps. More orv access is needed. Add and improve dune roads to 2-lanes.
- Create year round passive areas a mile on each side of the villages, create a passive area from ramp 34 to ramp 44, close ramp 43, Close ramp 49 when campers are in the Park and/or open ramp 49 when there are not campers in Frisco campground. A second option would be to close and relocate ramp 49 so it doesn't impact the area in front of Frisco campground. Third option would be to do away with ramp 49 and only have access via ramp 44 in Buxton. There should be a year round passive recreation area from wherever ramp 49 is located to ramp 55 in Hatteras. Any established interdunal roads should be closed to ORV use if standing water is in the road for longer than 24 hours. Open road when it is dry. Fresh water should not be ditched or curveted away from the natural physiographic conditions that dictate the area it is in. Close ORV trails if they become impacted with standing water. All the sound side sound ORV trails should be closed. Establish parking /staging areas for ORVs that allow people foot access to

the sound shore side (Cable Crossing, Coast Guard Station). Initiate a shuttle services; 4 wheels drive bus and boat service concessions can transport people to inlet spits.

- Especially in the Hatteras District options need to found that give all users their space. That may mean some areas will be for fishing only, some for birdwatching, other areas with ORV's and some without. And at the same time, birds, turtles, vegetation and sensitive lands such as wetlands and aquifers will need to have their space defined and protected. This is not going to be easy, but it can be done.
- Section 8.D.1 reads: "Establish a beach shuttle service to provide controlled access to popular fishing areas such as Cape Point and Hatteras Spit at times if/when those areas are otherwise closed to ORV access due to resource protection closures." Has anybody thought about what would be required to accomplish this at the Cape Point? 1. Turn the old Cape Point campground into a depot (presumably with a concession stand and bath house). The parking lot needs to be big enough to hold 200 vehicles plus a fleet of four wheel drive shuttles. 2. We'll need a depot at the Cape Point as well. And another around at False Point. But these will have to be moveable. And easily rebuilt after hurricanes and northeasters. 3. Out at the Point, an NPS employee who's title is "Cape Point Marshall" orders a guy who's been playing a trophy red drum for the last half hour to cut his line because the last bus leaves in 5 minutes. 4. The last bus is smelly and crowded with grumpy fishermen and their gear. The bus gets stuck in the sand halfway back from the point. The driver tells everybody to shut up and sit tight because no one but rangers are allowed to be on foot in this area. Sometime later, a monster tow truck arrives to free the shuttle. The bus gets back to the depot at 10:15 PM. The 14 person shuttle staff has been getting paid overtime since 8:00. This in pursuit of reducing the impact of humans in CHNS?
- Although there are areas of beach which I feel should be reopened to orvs: at the present time they constitute large geographic passive use areas. One is from the lighthouse almost to the Canadian Hole. Another is from the Frisco line all the way to ramp 55. The entire Kinnekeet village beach from just south of 34 to ramp 38 is a passive use area during the summer closure. Access to these areas in Avon, Frisco, and Hatteras and placement of parking places is necessary. Perhaps there is some grant money available for buying a couple of minimansions in the villages which could then be torn down or moved and would thus provide some access to these otherwise private beaches as well as parking. Increased access to Pamlico Sound with more roads and accompanying parking is a good direction for the future. The accesses which currently exist were there in 1960 and probably much earlier and sound use has increased probably even greater than ocean use since that time. Give us back the access to Goose Creek off the pole road to the inlet. This is a mighty effective fishing spot which appears to have been arbitrarily closed since Isabel.
- COMMENTING ON EACH SPECIFIC QUESTION REQUIRES MORE TIME THAN I HAVE AVAILABLE. GENERALLY, MINIMIZE ANY CHANGES TO THE STATUS QUO THAT RESULT IN LESS ORV ACCESS UNLESS OFFSET BY OTHER MEANS SUCH AS INTERDUNAL ROADS. SHUTTLE/BOAT SERVICE MIGHT BE MARGINALLY USEFUL IF LOGISTICS PROBLEMS CAN BE OVERCOME.
- Term "Hatteras Island Ranger District" has no relation to the importance of the Cape Point area barrier island habitat and its' natural processes. It is very "homo-centric". Visitors are better served if it were called something like the "Cape Point breeding and foraging habitat zone" since Cape Point shorebirds may forage at least 3-5 miles from the Point in either direction
- Additional ramps are needed in the Buxton Motel area, south of Canadian Hole and north of Hatteras Village. All spur and interdunal roads should be two lane with pull-offs. More sound side access is needed in the Tri-Village areas and near Avon.
- Remember, CHNS is a park! A national park that is very popular with ORV fisherman. Cape Point, Hatteras Inlet and Oregon Inlet are nearly inaccessible without an ORV. To suggest that all this is about plovers or turtles is blatantly absurd. Certain groups are merely trying to curtail fishing-period!
- Here again, emphasis should be on access; deemphasis on closure—lets find a way.
- The ORV ramp and coverage area should be expanded seasonally to include Hatteras and Frisco area, with new access area for ORV. Below Frisco Pier north of Buxton. ORV area should not be closed for passive use. Looking at the maps currently Pea Island has 11 miles of passive use areas. With 11 miles for bird nesting ect. The

environmentalists want more bird habitat, the OV users want more IRV beaches. Just leave the park status quo with less unjustified closures and better enforcement of existing regulations!

- I have answered some of the question on the permit section but on second thought I am not in favor of permits so I am not going to answer the rest of the question.
- If NPS is so intent on placing a passive recreation area at ramp 23, I suggest that area be situated from ramp 23 north toward the cottages. Ramp 23 and beach south of ramp is heavily used most of the year.
- A whole lot of people from different groups will not have a clue about most of these questions. They were told to vote no access, please try to keep that in mind.
- Severe crowding occurs on Hatteras Island on major summer holidays. The rest of the year no difficulty as for #'s of ORV's and protected species areas. Major attention only needed for Memorial Day, July 4th and Labor Day Weekend.
- It is necessary to keep the beach open for the economy of the region. It is dependent on the visitors in the summer and the fisherman in the fall and winter. The economy would completely collapse in the fall and winter a force many business out. The beaches are all ready closed in front of the villages and most of the beach below 38 to ramp 43 and from ramp 49 to ramp 55. I don't think the business of the area could survive more closures. Please use common sense and keep open what is open now.
- Access ramps are needed in the Buxton Motel area. Spur and interdunal roads needed to be two lane with pull offs. More sound side access is needed with hard surfaced roads for passive area usage. This takes passive use to sound side and access would not require 4wd vehicle.
- All sput and interdunal roads need to be two lane with pulloffs. Additional ORV access ramps are needed in the area between Canadian Hole and Hatteras Village.
- Additional ramps are needed in the Buxton Motel area, south of Canadian Hole and North of Hatteras Village. All spur and interdunal roads should be 2-lane with pull-offs. More sound side access is needed in the tri-village areas and near Avon.
- I want to compliment Mike Murray on his leadership of CHNS there last few years. What is a contentious and often upsetting situation-beach access, species preservation, lawsuits, has been handled without making matters worse. When the beach has to be closed, alternate routes were established. When lawsuits threatened, emotion did not rule but common sense. If only common sense could rule, everywhere. Instead of spending 1000's of dollars to monitor nests and plants in hospital areas only to see the surf and wind destroy, everything- wouldn't it be wonderful to just let nature rule. I am convinced the birds will find a way to reproduce in areas other than prime people habitat. Thank you, Mike Murray, for what you have done and will continue to do for so many of use who have chosen to make our home on Hatteras Island-our piece of Paradise
- Both turtle and bird closures are not working with the current plans in place. The park needs to find a plan that will work. Current resource management should be fired. They seem to want closure for closure, not for the protection of species. More access in the villages is needed. As is, when seasonal closure is put into effect the park becomes a private beach for the front row houses. We should have more parking closer to the beach. No parking on the shoulder of HWY 12 should be allowed, as is on Pea Island.
- Additional ramps are needed in the Buxton Motel area, south of the Canadian hole and north of Hatteras Village. All spur and interdunal roads should be 2 lanes with pull-offs.
- More soundside access is needed in the Tri-Village areas near Avon.
- I feel the status quo approach to monitoring bird breeding activity benefits everyone including the ORV user.
- There should be a balance between the usage of ORVs and the maintaining of the resource. This could be done with a restricted corridor. This would be maintained by the park service with fencing or posts. The corridor should be

maintained as a two-vehicle wide corridor. At intervals within the corridor, there should be turnouts into a parking area, wide enough for several vehicles to park without restricting the flow of traffic through the corridor. These corridors should be moveable. This would allow access around sensitive areas such as Cape Point and Hatteras Spot, allowing the ORV to remain inside of the corridor and the driver to maintain access to the beach for fishing as well as other recreational activities without being a threat to the resource.

- The restrictions on the corridors should be in place especially during the times of beach closure. One of the restrictions should be no exiting the corridor through barriers except as a pedestrian. The ORV user should park the vehicle and access the beach as a pedestrian user with the vehicle parked within the corridor. These corridors should be moved as closures come into effect, so as to adapt to the size and accessibility around the closure. In many cases interdunal access around an area may have to be implemented, but could give access around the closure without destruction of the resource.
- These corridors should be maintained on a year-round basis. Where access by vehicle directly to the shore can be maintained, it should be allowed with the corridor leading to the spot or spots accessible. In the cases of closures or no ORV usage, corridors should be used to bypass closures.
- Turtle closures should be reassessed by the USFWS as well as the park service. During times of severe storm damage, as has been the case for many years, the turtle hatch rate has been dismal at the least. Incubation should be looked into as an alternative to natural hatching in areas of nesting. Meaning, relocated the nest where necessary, to allow a hatch. Many areas, such as Cape Point as well as near ramp 34 in Avon, and Frisco beaches are subject to change with winds. Many times turtle eggs are turned up by this erosion and lay there never hatching. Having volunteers to site nesting in a specific spot during nesting periods to late nests to be located and removed would be an asset. Not only would it allow more turtles to hatch, but it would also allow the monitoring of those other younger hatchlings and allow them to go seaward without predators, such as gulls destroying them. In the past, efforts similar to these were used with a much higher and more successful hatch rate for turtles. It is not understood why these types of hatch rates were ceased, however they do work and should be looked at as an alternative to the unsuccessful methods being used now.
- Additional ramps are needed in the Buxton motel area, south of Canadian hole and north of Hatteras Village. More soundside access is needed in Tri-Village area near Avon.
- More ramps in better locations are needed, not less, especially in the Buxton and Hatteras village areas. Access roads should either be wider or have more turn offs to allow vehicles to pass each other (2 lane road is preferred). Definitely need more sound side access, sound side parking, and better signage indicating what and where roads lead. Some walkover areas would be fine since the distances around Buxton, Frisco and the north side of Hatteras are short. From Avon north more sound side access is needed with wide parking areas at the water, in addition better signage is required even for the limited access that now exists
- The beach from ramp 38 to the Buxton Motel area is under utilized-should be open. Ramp put in north of Motels. Need a ramp soundside north of Hatteras Village. Any spur, interdunal road, ect., should be 2 way for safety reasons
- As set forth throughout, are opposed to blanket closures. Closures should occur only where active species are observed. Additional parking and other similar facilities to encourage pedestrian use is beneficial so long as current ORV use is not diminished.
- Several years ago there was a story in the VA Pilot. The story was of a turtle nest that appeared in a developed area of Sandbridge. Instead of closing the area and letting nature take its course the nest was moved to the park area farther south. I guess if you have the money to buy a million dollar beach front house you can have special privileges and the rules don't apply. If you have rules for beach closures for habitat they should apply to all areas even in front of the villages. After all, while on the beach that little bit of beach in front of my ORV is as important to me as it is for the owner of the million dollar house.
- The evidence, documented most recently by the NPS report for the 2007 season, does not indicate ORV's are responsible for bird or turtle nest failures. Existing NPS procedures are largely effective in preventing ORV damage to nests. Better signage, more visible at night, would make the current procedures even more effective by preventing ORV driving below the high tide line at nest closures. (Many drivers drive below the high tide line to take advantage

of the hard packed sand and may not see signs if they are not very close to this area.) This is not an ORV issue therefore. Predators, as well as the violence of storms, are the primary nest failure culprits. Many of the suggestions in this document fail to recognize this important point and attempt to put an undue burden on the ORV user. The NPS should look for ways to make the current bird and turtle nesting activity more successful before it proposes expensive management programs that may be just as unsuccessful. Predator controls should be enhanced, as long as, in the process, new endangered species are not created. The NPS should also give strong consideration to turtle nest relocation as a standard. As mentioned above, the 2007 report confirms that ORV's did not significantly impact 2007 nesting activity, yet success rates were marginal. Temporary beach closures were an inconvenience, but not outrageous. However, turtle nest relocation and management would ensure that the maximum possible success rate occurs.

- I don't pretend to be a scientist, but the trend data on plover nestings over the last twenty years must call into question the viability of the CHNRS as a nesting area. One must wonder if global warming has changed the area sufficiently that plovers no longer favor the area for breeding activity. I don't advocate using financial resources to confirm this possibility. I do believe a moderate level of common sense must be used in the management of this resource.
- Reopen access points currently closed for no defensible reason (not safety, not resource, not swimming). Stop the privatization of CAHA. Provide additional soundside access and interdunal roads.
- Cape Point is THE premier surf fishing destination on the east coast of the US. It is one of the premier surf fishing destinations in the WORLD. Surf fisherman and by and large law abiding people. Please don't take away our source of recreation. Additional ramps are needed in the Buxton Motel are, south of Canadian Hole, and north of Hatteras village. All spur an interdunal roads should be two-lane to accommodate pull-offs. More sound-side access is needed in the tri-village areas and near Avon.
- Re passive recreation areas. If there are to be areas permanently denied use by ORVs, will an equal effort be made in respect to space, for ORV users to have and all other users denied? How can ORV users be continually closed out? Seems like if one mile was set up for "passive recreational use", then another mile should be set up for ORV use only.

## **9. Site Specific Management: Ocracoke Island Ranger District**

### **9.A. Increase ORV Areas Seasonally**

**9.A.1** Expand ORV access south of Ramp 59 from June through August to off-set crowding from resource closures elsewhere on the island.

#### **Definitely Effective**

- This is great beach with little to no use (south of ramp 59) that should be expanded to full ORV use all year. If resource closures restrict usage at the south end of the island this area will be a great addition.
- 9.A.1 is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003.
- But will need to watch for pedestrians using the Beach Access just south of Ramp 59.

#### **May Be Effective**

- I don't think the resource closures at the south end of the island or between the airport ramp and Ramp 72 have generated a genuine need for offset to this point. ORV users seem to have enough room.
- If closed for safety, not just seasonally
- Ramp 59 is a safety closure and not a seasonal closure as the map shows.

### **Not Effective**

- Leave passive areas in place. Resource closures can happen anywhere but are more likely at the inlets and spits. If special interest groups advocate for specific sections of the Park for ORV access they should accept that resource restrictions go with those areas.
- Again you create major portions of the beach or sound side closed that are highly used by recreational visitors and in a highly washover area. Instead why don't you partner with Corp. of Engineer and other entities to provide more and larger dredge spoil islands in the sound that can be created, maintained and closed to public as resting and breeding areas for this wild life. The area of Cape Hatteras Seashore is a shoulder area for both nesting and wintering plovers and be at the edge of their habitat makes it a poor choice for the high cost of trying to increase their population here. Instead you can take Portsmouth Island who only sees a small percentage of visitors compared to this recreational seashore to do these closures. Portsmouth has little dune structure and many better areas to promote nest and wintering habitats. Also in the vegetated portion of this area that have become unfit for breeding habitat open portions of them each winter to ORV and encourage use of the vegetated area opened to expand the habitat needed for breeding the next season. (comment repeated for 9.A.2)

**9.A.2** Allow ORV use areas to expand into passive recreation areas during resource closures at the spits.

### **Definitely Effective**

- There are great stretches of beach on this island that are underutilized.

### **May Be Effective**

- Passive recreation areas should only be for life guarded beaches. Dividing the beaches in the Park for single use will result in an escalation of law enforcement issues and conflict resolution.
- Restrict passive recreation areas to lifeguarded beaches and maximum use of the resources by all citizens would result.
- Expansion of ORV use areas should be based upon conditions at the time, including the limits placed on access by Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added a 5.4 mile safety closures that has remained in effect since 2003.
- Woe is me if we allow "single" use beaches to exist. Most people have been compromising so far.
- Ramp 59 is a safety closure and not a seasonal closure as the maps show. Dividing the beaches in the Park for single use will result in an escalation of law enforcement issues and conflict resolution.

### **Not Effective**

- I basically don't believe any area should be expended to absorb more ORV use (or pedestrian use), period. If areas are closed, they are closed. The public needs to understand and respect that.
- More ramps would help ease the need for expansion.
- Leave passive areas in place. Resource closures can happen anywhere but are more likely at the inlets and spits. If special interest groups advocate for specific sections of the Park for ORV access they should accept that resource restrictions go with those areas.

## **9.B. Provide Additional Soundside Access and Parking**

**9.B.1** Formalize existing soundside access points.

### **Definitely Effective**

- 9.B.1 is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003.
- Add parking and open all old south side trails to include an interconnecting road where possible

**May Be Effective**

- Restrict ORV access to winter use only.
- Add parking for and open all old sound side trails to include an interconnecting road where possible.
- The different soundside spots are all subject to storm damage and should be relocated if necessary to maintain access.

**Not Effective**

- Need to Add parking for and open all old sound side trails to include an interconnecting road.

**9.B.2** Identify locations for additional parking and access to existing soundside beaches.

**Definitely Effective**

- open more areas to lessen crowding
- 9.B.2 is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003.

**May Be Effective**

- Agreed that more soundside access is needed.
- All areas of the sound that can be accessed should be opened, with parking, trash cans and porta-potties.
- Restrict ORV access to winter use only.
- This is a good idea if the parking is along NC 12 and access is by foot.

**9.B.3** Create a swim beach at the north end of the island on the soundside.

**Definitely Effective**

- Restrict ORV access to winter use only.
- You must mean a lifeguard beach as all beaches are swim beaches. If created parking must be provided

**May Be Effective**

- If the demand is there, and to keep people away from dune hopping.
- I think the only persons who would use a soundside swim beach at the north end of the island are day trippers from Hatteras. Those staying in the village would not use this.
- If parking is expanded, trash cans & porta-potties will be needed.
- You'd better get some really good lifeguards.

- But the soundside areas are usually shallow with surrounding marsh. Can you meet the environmental demands for a swimming site?

**Not Effective**

- Current is too strong, would endanger swimmers.
- It is unclear what is meant by a swim beach. If the intent is to provide a lifeguard, I don't really see the necessity for this in ankle to need deep water--scarce resources would be more effective in other areas.
- This is prime T/E species foraging and predator avoidance habitat.
- There are bugs and jellyfish in that area.
- I don't think this is necessary because it is so far from Ocracoke village. The beach by the ferry docks already provides excellent shelling and wading opportunities.

**9.C. Provide Alternate Routes and/or Alternative Transportation**

**9.C.1** Increase the number of ramps, creating a “cell system” to allow for convenient alternate routes around resource closures in ORV areas.

**May Be Effective**

- I don't really know what a “cell system” might be. An increased number of ramps means increased law enforcement requirements, etc.
- This could also be accomplished with an additional interdunal road system.

**Not Effective**

- While this may be desirable, given the limited width of beaches north of the village, it is not likely that additional ORV routes and ramps can be provided without adversely impacting the resource. The exceptions may be the spits where the width is sufficient to allow for interdunal road systems.
- Reduce the number of ramps open, old ramps could be used and opened as needed if they can provide access to unaffected ORV areas.
- Add parking for and open all old soundside trails to include an interconnecting road where possible.

**9.C.2** Provide alternative access to South Point if/when it is closed to ORV access.

**Definitely Effective**

- 9.C.2 is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003.
- This is a must but maintaining a one hundred foot corridor in front of, thru or behind is also an option

**May Be Effective**

- Depends on access method.

### **Not Effective**

- Effectiveness and visitor use of these services is minimal due to weather constraints and the cost of insurance for the conveyances

### **9.C.3 Operate a beach shuttle service between Ramp 72 and South Point.**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Shuttles could provide all users (not just those with ORVs) access to exceptional recreational resources and provide new economic opportunities for local residents.

#### **May Be Effective**

- Effective only if ORV access is further restricted to winter use only.

### **Not Effective**

- Effectiveness and visitor use of these services is minimal due to weather constraints and the cost of insurance for the conveyances
- Liability/Insurance would be a serious issue
- There is no way I could use this, I cannot carry what I need for a day at the beach in one arm load(see the same type questions for the other points & spits)
- While this may be desirable, given the limited width of beaches north of the village, it is not likely that additional ORV routes and ramps can be provided without adversely impacting the resource. The exceptions may be the spits where the width is sufficient to allow for interdunal road systems.
- This is not financially or logistically feasible. Interdunal roads, bypasses, etc. provide much better alternatives to providing access during breeding season.
- At least on Ocracoke, Howard's Pub is conveniently located for use a shuttle depot. We can knock back a cold draft while we wait for the next shuttle.
- Not cost effective and due to high volume use by ORV users. Users also bring rods, reels, coolers. Umbrellas, kiteboards, surf boards etc. making this impossible. Again you create major portions of the beach or sound side closed that are highly used by recreational visitors and in a highly washover area. Instead why don't you partner with Corp. of Engineer and other entities to provide more and larger dredge spoil islands in the sound that can be created, maintained and closed to public as resting and breeding areas for this wild life. The area of Cape Hatteras Seashore is a shoulder area for both nesting and wintering plovers and be at the edge of their habitat makes it a poor choice for the high cost of trying to increase their population here. Instead you can take Portsmouth Island who only sees a small percentage of visitors compared to this recreational seashore to do these closures. Portsmouth has little dune structure and many better areas to promote nest and wintering habitats. Also in the vegetated portion of this area that have become unfit for breeding habitat open portions of them each winter to ORV and encourage use of the vegetated area opened to expand the habitat needed for breeding the next season. (comment repeated for 9.C.4)
- Most fishermen and picnickers have too much stuff to load into a shuttle. Would only serve sight-seers wanting a brief visit.

### **9.C.4 Operate a water taxi from Silver Lake Harbor to South Point.**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Shuttles could provide all users (not just those with ORVs) access to exceptional recreationally resources and provide new economic opportunities for local residents.

**May Be Effective**

- If you did this would you first attempt to see if it would be used? I drive my skiff to South Point all the time from the canals, so I would not want to use this service.

**Not Effective**

- Would have weather constraints
- Won't work in windy weather, at night, and would cost too much to implement. Who would carry the insurance?
- This is not financially or logistically feasible. Interdunal roads, bypasses, etc. provide much better alternatives to providing access during breeding season.
- Damaging to the natural resource.
- Costly, and intrusive on those seeking quite and fishing experience. Would tend to congregate people close to shuttle landing

**9.D. Establish Passive Recreation Areas**

**9.D.1** Establish a passive recreation area from Ramp 70, near the airstrip, to Ramp 68 May to September. (*status quo*)

**Definitely Effective**

- And add another parking area and walkway over the dunes between Ramp 70 and Ramp 68 to ease demand on the Day Area and spread people out.

**May Be Effective**

- A vehicle access corridor should be added to allow access past the area.
- This area coincides with the lifeguarded beach. If the entire 2 mile stretch is identified as seasonally closed passive recreation, the area north of ramp 68 should be left open to ORV use, especially since safety closures criteria contained in Superintendent's Order Number 7 have resulted in the permanent closure of 5.4 miles of beach from ramp 59 to ramp 67.

**Not Effective**

- reopen to ORVs in the winter
- Passive recreation areas should only be for life guarded beaches.
- Passive recreation where there are lifeguards only, ramp 67.

**9.D.2** Establish a passive recreation area from Ramp 67 to Ramp 59 year-round. (*status quo*)

**Definitely Effective**

- But limit it to the area between the Pony Pen Beach Access and the Beach Access south of Ramp 59.

**May Be Effective**

- Should be seasonal
- Why is it status quo to have passive recreation for an eight-mile section of beach? Is this a closed beach due to safety closure in past or have I missed this permanent closure in the past? I cannot support any eight mile permanent closure within the seashore. Half Mile should be enough passive beach year round.

**Not Effective**

- reopen to ORVs in winter
- Single use beaches will not work and passive recreation areas should only be for life guarded beaches.
- That's 8 miles, too long.
- This area is underutilized. Nude sunbathing should not be allowed in this park, period.
- This area does NOT coincide with the lifeguarded beach. Given the fact that there is no parking north of ramp 68, this area is grossly underutilized. As such the area from provides for a less crowded ORV area than is currently available at the south spit. Opening this area would expand the type of recreation opportunities available to ORV users without significantly impacting passive use recreational activities.

**Not Effective**

- not justified in off season and not status quo. This quote from 11 May 07 Seasonal Closure notice "Ocracoke Island from 0.5 miles South of Ramp 67 to 0.25 miles North of Ramp 70". The first map is in error also in showing seasonal closure from Ramp 59 to 67.

**9.D.3** Establish a seasonal passive recreation area from Ramp 67 to Ramp 59.

**Definitely Effective**

- This actually is better then the status quo.
- In my recollection, the beach was closed from 1 mile north of Ramp 67 to 1 mile south of Ramp 59. If this area is open off-season, then a good idea.

**May Be Effective**

- only if it meets or exceeds wildlife objectives.

**Not Effective**

- Passive recreation areas should only be for life guarded beaches.
- That's 8 miles, too long.
- Seasonal ORV access
- A seasonal passive area at 67 is enough, if it gets crowded expand the parking there and use some more beach. But not to another ramp. Off-season it should be open to full ORV use.
- This area does NOT coincide with the lifeguarded beach. Given the fact that there is no parking north of ramp 68, this area is grossly underutilized. As such the area from provides for a less crowded ORV area than is currently available at the south spit. Opening this area would expand the type of recreation opportunities available to ORV users without significantly impacting passive use recreational activities.
- Do away with seasonal non- seasonal recreation seasons.

- Only a handful of people use this stretch of beach and it is currently closed to ORV use because of a “safety” closure which must be reviewed on a monthly basis. During the time that the bridges were being replaced 3.3 miles of this beach was determined to be “safe” enough to be driven on so it should be open to ORV use all year

## **9.E. Establish ORV Use Areas**

### **9.E.1 Open Ramp 70 to the spit year-round to ORV use. (*status quo*)**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Make sure one of these ramps can be used after floods, drainage.
- 9.E.1 is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003.
- Entire beach of Ocracoke should be open to ORV use except during village and campground closures and possibly 2 passive half mile areas one either end of the island with ramps on either side of summer and year round closures. Ramps should be installed on either side of safety closures as well. (comment repeated for 9.E.2 and 9.E.3)

#### **Not Effective**

- Prime T/E habitat; make it vehicle free at least until the T/E species numbers reach the recovery plan standards.

### **9.E.2 Open Ramp 68 to Ramp 67 year-round to ORV use. (*status quo*)**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- 9.E.2 is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003

#### **May Be Effective**

- Ramp 68 is a passive area, so a pass through will be needed to get to ramp 67.

#### **Not Effective**

- Prime T/E habitat; make it vehicle free at least until the T/E species numbers reach the recovery plan standards. and then the area is likely to be needed for foraging and predator evasion..

### **9.E.3 Open Ramp 59 to north end of the island to ORV use. (*status quo*)**

#### **Definitely Effective**

- Plus open the beach south of ramp 59. The beach should be open to at least ramp 67, and maybe ramp68.
- 9.E.3 is the minimum requirement to handle current use, especially in light of Superintendent's Order No. 7 which added safety closures to the status quo and the Interim Plan which expanded resource closures from the status quo as it existed prior to 2003.

## **Additional comments regarding ORV management options at Ocracoke:**

- If ORV access is prohibited in this area it will have a devastating economic impact. I will not have a reason to visit this area if I do not have access to the beach.

- More sound side access is needed for islanders and visitors. ORV driving at the north end is less of a priority for me, so I prefer limits on ORV driving there rather than south.
- All efforts / resources should be expended to extend access. All efforts to inhibit access are waste of federal monies.
- Given the rural nature of this island the status quo is working very well along most of the island. In general open access for ORV use to these areas should be expanded to the extent possible during the off season.
- As previously stated, I have been coming to Hatteras for 30 years. Certainly during that time, certainly the crowds have increased, but the overall health of the island has NOT. This is due, I believe to several factors. One is the efficient enforcement of exiting laws by the NPS Rangers, but a far more important factor is the respect (I would use the word 'awe' if it were not so badly overused) that the vast majority of visitors have for this sacred place. And 'sacred' may not be such an exaggeration. Most people, whether they are newbies or veterans realize that it truly doesn't get any better than this. Hatteras is Paradise, pure and simple. The Pacific Beaches cannot compare, frankly neither can the Hawaiian Islands. This is something that we all want to preserve, but NOT at the cost of putting the island under a 'glass bubble'. The regulations that are currently in place are more than adequate to preserve this national treasure and still allow visitors to enjoy it. As in most cases, more laws are not the answer. More enforcement, in some instances, may be. There is no reason that endangered species and recreational user cannot co-exist. In fact, it happens beautifully on Hatteras Island every day. If the beaches are ill advisedly over regulated, Hatteras will be no more than a big Ocean City. To quote Don McClean, that would indeed be the day the music died. And with it the economy of HI would also die a quick and painful death. And if we are all very honest about it, the endangered species would not be one bit safer because when the current laws are enforced (in most cases voluntarily, but in some instances with a little coaxing from NPS), there is little if any danger to their safety from the ORV users. In order to make these creatures more secure, we need to begin looking more earnestly at those factors that are really harmful to them: predators being a good place to begin.
- The beach north of the camp grounds should be open from ramp 68 up to ramp 59. The nude sunbathing is against the law & should be discontinued in that area. One of the ramps to the south point(70 or 72) needs to have drainage fixed so access to the point is available after storms. If there are interior salt ponds & small creeks at the south that are surrounded by vegetation, this should be cleared so the birds will have additional feeding areas, and breeding areas farther from the surf line. It will lessen the chance predators getting the unfledged chicks & keep the ORV users away from the birds.
- ORV access on Ocracoke has become relegated to the southern spit with the northern spit. The latter is typically open only occasionally. The limits on access have resulted from. 1. A change in policy from travel at your own risk to a policy of defining safety closures as per superintendent's order no. 7. This policy has left nearly the entire stretch of beach from ramp 59 to ramp 67 closed year round since 2003. While labeled safety closure, there are no instances of safety related issues from allowing people to travel at their own risk. Any safety concerns have been related to failure to abide by speed limits. 2. Expansion of resource closures that resulted from the newly implemented Interim Plan. Based upon the above observations, anything that can be done to expand ORV access, thus providing for ORV experiences different from the type afforded in the heavily used south spit should be done. Insofar as, there is minimal parking, the expansion of ORV use areas would have little to no impact on passive use. Furthermore, allowing ORV access to these undeveloped areas will reduce the need to park on the side of the road, reducing safety concerns. Finally, allowing ORV access to these undeveloped areas will reduce the need to walk on the dunes to access the beaches, allowing the dunes that were damaged by Hurricane Isabel a chance to redevelop. Bottom line, except for the areas immediately surrounding Ocracoke Village, the Ocracoke Day Use area, and the Ocracoke Campground, access to Ocracoke's beaches is extremely limited. Expanding access will provide for increased recreational opportunities, improve safety, and place less stress on the resource.
- I spend a full week with my family on Ocracoke each year. It is my all time favorite vacationing spot. I've been to Florida, California, Bahamas, Antigua, among many other beaches and I would not trade my week at Ocracoke for any of them. Last year after our vacation, I asked my kids if they would rather go somewhere else like Myrtle Beach so there would be more for them to do, they are 13 and 8, and they both looked at me and said "Why?" It made me feel great, I was like they really get it, they love it as much as I do. What never ceases to amaze me is how much of that huge open beach is closed to birds. Last year we spent the week of 7/15 – 7/21. We spent everyday out on the beach, for a minimum of 5 hours each day. Not even one time was there one bird in the miles and miles of closed

beach for the birds. That is 'NOT EVEN ONE BIRD!' However, there were always birds around the people. My point is, to think that much beach needs to be closed to birds is insane. The birds do not go where the enclosure are, they go where the people are. Just think about these things before you go closing a National Park to people, or so severely limiting access that people can not enjoy land that was promised to them.

- ORV use on the Ocracoke beaches should be permitted seasonally only in winter. This island is rapidly becoming a major tourist destination with worldwide recognition. First-time visitors should not be left with the impression of an American national treasure mis-managed as cowboy highway. Replace ramps with parking areas for pedestrian access throughout the district.
- Leave passive areas in place, Ocracoke district has a long history of extensive passive areas that have proven to have positive economic input on the local community. Do not change passive areas into ORV areas when resource closures close ORV areas. Design 2 ramps for Ocracoke one at the North end one in the South end. Ramps should be situated so that they divide passive areas from ORV areas. Institute shuttles services provide by local concessionaries. Do away with seasonal and non-seasonal closures.
- all area names relate to ORVs. Rename them for the prime T/E habitat they contain and use this to educate the public. More dependence on past and present good science should be used in all T/E species decisions.
- Dividing the beaches in the park will not work & will result in user conflicts & an enforcement nightmare. This workbook is very intimidating & was a pain in the neck to do. I myself spent 44 hours reading & trying to make sense of some of the questions. I am sure loads of people were turned off by the size of this document. I think it was purposely designed this way to limit the number of comments.
- I think that a swimming area on the north end of the Island sound side is a great idea. This is a natural area behind the area where the dredge is piled up. There is also a need for more parking and trash dumpsters.. I hope they do not close more of the best selling are in North Carolina.
- Some of the best fishing year-round is on Ocracoke Island. Serious anglers from all over the country flock to these beaches spring and fall to catch trophy red drum. Access to best fishing spots require ORVs because of distance from Rt 12 to sites. Keep these areas open and your crowding on other ramps (43, 44) will reduce. One basic ORV plan can serve the entire NPS it does not have to be complicated, and it does need to accommodate the visitors who come to enjoy this recreational area.
- I have always enjoyed my fishing/sight seeing trips to Ocracoke Island. The one thing I would like to see is the prompt clearing of the road..once wet..to the south spit.
- This workbook was labor intensive, time consuming and not in OUR job descriptions! In other words I was not earning any money for all the hours I have spent completing this! Many, many, many of the questions were repetitive and a complete waste of time! PLEASE do not use this format again! Furthermore the general public has no idea what the USGS protocols were really meant to accomplish or and at whose request! This was an agenda driven attempt at closing the beaches. If this workbook was meant to really be for public comment, then it needs to be a lot simpler and user friendly. If it was meant mostly for reg-neg members than just give it to us and quit calling it a public comment, when the majority of the public has no earthly idea what 90% of this workbook is talking about!
- The economy of Ocracoke Island and our business, Tradewinds, is dependent on ORV use and access to the North End and South Point area of the island. Tourists visit Ocracoke because of the ability to access these unique points of the island. These are the only places on the island near enough to the inlets, where people can fish for Spanish mackerel without a boat. These also are the places where the vast majority of large red drum and flounder can be caught due to their migration. Opening other areas of the beach to ORV use during closures does NOT replace the ability to catch these fish in those unique critical areas. ORV use must be maintained to and through these areas , either by corridor or interdunal roads around any closures.
- Even during short or brief closures of these areas, we have experienced significant loss in business in our shop. Any extended closures to ORV use in these areas would significantly impact our ability to continue our business, which has been open for over 30 years, and remain on the island. While we see the effect of a closure first, other businesses

such as motels and restaurants, would see this soon after, as the vast majority of visitors during the spring and fall are surf fishermen.

- With the exception of its ends Ocracoke has a great deal of under utilized ocean and sound front. Restricting ORV is unnecessary but additional parking areas for walkover use is desirable especially to minimize impact on the environment. Additionally, some porta-potti facilities located at either/both parking lots or beach accesses would be beneficial.
- All of the locked up private sound side access should be open to the public
- ORV access on Ocracoke has become relegated to the southern spit with the northern spit. The latter is typically open only occasionally. The limits on access have resulted from.
- A change in policy from travel at your own risk to a policy of defining safety closures as per superintendent's order no. 7. This policy has left nearly the entire stretch of beach from ramp 59 to ramp 67 closed year round since 2003. While labeled safety closure, there are no instances of safety related issues from allowing people to travel at their own risk. Any safety concerns have been related to failure to abide by speed limits.
- Expansion of resource closures that resulted from the newly implemented Interim Plan.
- Based upon the above observations, anything that can be done to expand ORV access, thus providing for ORV experiences different from the type afforded in the heavily used south spit should be done. Insofar as, there is minimal parking, the expansion of ORV use areas would have little to no impact on passive use. Furthermore, allowing ORV access to these undeveloped areas will reduce the need to park on the side of the road, reducing safety concerns. Finally, allowing ORV access to these undeveloped areas will reduce the need to walk on the dunes to access the beaches, allowing the dunes that were damaged by Hurricane Isabel a chance to redevelop.
- Bottom line, except for the areas immediately surrounding Ocracoke Village, the Ocracoke Day Use area, and the Ocracoke Campground, access to Ocracoke's beaches is extremely limited. Expanding access will provide for increased recreational opportunities, improve safety, and place less stress on the resource.
- The ORV access management on Ocracoke seems to be working fine. I think the status quo is acceptable for these access points. Ocracoke reaches less traffic than Hatteras Island. I'd appreciate more soundside access points and one or two air pumps on Ocracoke.